DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 052 SO 011 986

AUTHOR Kinsey, David C., Ed.; Bing, John W., Ed.
TITLE Nonformal Education in Ghana: A Project Report.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts Univ., Amherst. Center for International Education.
SPONS AGENCY Agency for International Development (Dept. of State), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Oct 78
NOTE 200p.; For a related document, see SO 011 997
AVAILABLE FROM Center for International Education, Hills House South, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003 ($5.00)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Education; Community Involvement; *Developing Nations; *Educational Development; Foreign Countries; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; International Programs; Models; *Nonformal Education; *Program Development; Rural Areas
IDENTIFIERS *Ghana

ABSTRACT

The document describes a rural nonformal education field service grant project in Koforidua, Ghana, carried out by the University of Massachusetts' Center of International Education in collaboration with the University of Ghana's Institute of Adult Education and the People's Education Association of Ghana. The project was designed to increase the capability of the university to assist developing countries with development-oriented nonformal education programs. Special program characteristics include combined service, training, and research; tripartite institutional relationships; interinstitutional collaboration; an action-based training model; short term staffing; and multiple small projects. The document is presented in seven chapters. Chapter I describes the purpose and nature of the project, the participating organizations, and the initial organization, site exploration and selection, and developmental phases. Chapter II discusses theoretical considerations of collaborative programs, design issues, related specific aspects of the Ghana program, and offers staff comments on the collaborative process. Chapters III through VI examine the rationale, description, and possible insights obtained for each subproject, such as a village facilitation branch model, popular culture models, an adult literacy program, and wayside mechanics workshops. Chapter VII offers observations and conclusions about the overall program characteristics. Continuing activities in Ghana after the end of the project indicated program effectiveness. (CK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED177052

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NONFORMAL EDUCATION IN GHANA

A PROJECT REPORT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C.I.E.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Edited by

David C. Kinsey

John W. Bing

CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003

October, 1978

SP011 986

Printed in the United States of America

ISBN 0-932288-52-9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
FOREWORD		vii
INTRODUCTION		1
Chapter		
I.	OVERVIEW OF PROJECT	13
II.	EXPERIMENT IN COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	27
III.	VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING OF RURAL FACILITATORS	77
IV.	CULTURAL GROUPS AS AN EDUCATIONAL VEHICLE	111
V.	ASSISTANCE IN ADULT LITERACY	141
VI.	SUPPORT OF INDIGENOUS VOCATIONAL TRADES	163
VII.	GENERAL OBSERVATIONS	187

FOREWORD

I am happy to have the opportunity to write the foreword to the report on the collaborative program between the Center for International Education (UMass), the Institute of Adult Education (IAE), and the People's Educational Association (PEA).

I would like to say that the Team from the Center for International Education worked hard. They cooperated and got the program off the ground in the selected villages.

Special mention must be made of the successful water project at Okorase of which the Okorase people are so proud; the two mile road from Nyerede to Koforidua; the literacy classes at Nankese, Suhyen and Larteh; and the Wayside Fitters' program at Koforidua.

Praise must go to Mr. Stephen McLaughlin for his ingenuity in organizing the Wayside Fitters and arranging for evening classes for masters and apprentices in auto mechanics which will commence in October, 1978.

The Cultural Groups were in existence, but with the arrival of Mr. Robert Russell, skits or playlets were introduced into these groups of the People's Educational Association which made the Cultural Groups not only for entertainment but also an educational tool. This innovation is welcomed by our Cultural Groups.

This foreword cannot be complete without the mention of people like Professor Felix McGowan, Dr. Ishmael Moletsane and Mrs. Janice Smith,

who were either coordinator/director or administrator of the program at one time or the other. Without them the project would not have ended successfully. Others whose contributions should equally be appreciated are Ms. Linda Abrams, Mrs. Elvyn Jones-Dube and Mr. V.K. Quist. Mr. Quist is the Ghanaian member of the UMass Team who worked on the program throughout the whole period.

And finally, appreciation should be expressed to the editors, Mr. John Bing and Dr. David Kinsey, and to all those connected with the Ghanaian Project at the Center for International Education. The National Executive of the People's Educational Association and I are most grateful to you all.

We hope all those who read this report will find some new insights into a tripartite relationship, inter-institutional collaboration, action-based training and multiple small projects.

T.K. Hagan
President
People's Educational
Association
Ghana

NONFORMAL EDUCATION IN GHANA

INTRODUCTION

David Kinsey

INTRODUCTION

This report presents a description and analysis of nonformal educational activities carried out in Ghana over a two-year period in 1976-77. Its purpose is to share the ideas, problems and learnings that emerged from this experience with those who are concerned with the improvement of rural nonformal education programs as well as the development of more effective collaborative relationships between American universities and such field programs.

The project was enabled by a 211(d) grant from USAID to the Center for International Education (CIE) at the University of Massachusetts for the purpose of improving competence and techniques in the field of nonformal education. As a part of this grant there was provision for an overseas field site where service could be offered to a rural nonformal education program in the context of mutual experimentation with new ideas and shared training experiences. The participating parties in the selected site in Ghana were the Institute of Adult Education (IAE) of the University of Ghana at Legon, and the related but private voluntary organization of the Peoples' Education Association (PEA). The field activities were based in Koforidua, the seat of the Eastern Region of the PEA, and involved villages in the surrounding area.

In undertaking these field activities in nonformal education the Center was committed to the principle of collaborative program development. Whether on an institutional or individual level, it was intended

that activities should be developed in a participatory manner and that such an effort would yield a greater understanding of the collaborative model. In addition there was a desire to work directly with nonformal education field personnel on the level where they interacted with village clientele and with each other. Committed to the principle of a facilitating rather than directing style of nonformal education leadership, Center members felt that it was on this level that one could best respond to field needs and encounter field realities that would help develop the facilitator concept. And finally it was anticipated that the Center could contribute by playing a brokerage role in the introduction and development of new program ideas, whether adapted from other sources or derived from the local situation. In principle it was held that such ideas or techniques should be conceived as incremental and low-cost measures that could be sustained by local personnel after their development. In the process of developing such ideas and training personnel in their use it was hoped that insights of broader utility could be derived about a given idea or training methodology.

While the project emerged as a collection of separate and staggered sub-projects in the area of Koforidua, as a whole it had a number of characteristics that set it apart as a particular species among university-based projects. In several respects these features differed from the Center's earlier nonformal education project in Ecuador,[1] and its subsequent nonformal education projects in Thailand and Guatemala. Six of these program characteristics may be noted.

---

[1]See Nonformal Education in Ecuador, 1971-1975 (Amherst: Center for International Education, University of Massachusetts, July, 1975).

A. Combined Service-Training-Research Program

Developmental assistance offered a local program from the outside is typically provided by private, governmental or international agencies, or by professional consulting groups associated with a university. Whether services are offered on a business contract basis or as a donation, they are usually in the form of direct assistance with material aid, program consulting or arranging for personnel training. University programs per se tend either to be research-oriented in the field or to focus on providing degree programs for foreign personnel on their campuses. In this project the Center, as an integral part of the University of Massachusetts, was committed to using its own grant funds and personnel for a combination of developmental service, training and research. Service was viewed more in terms of facilitating program development than giving. Training was to occur either through participatory action and workshops in the field or through short-term, non-degree internships for Ghanaians at the University of Massachusetts, with the expectation that in many respects training benefits would be mutual. And research was to be derived from action in the field, and was not to interfere with priority service and training needs.

B. Tripartite Institutional Relationships

In a field project a university's primary relationship may be: (a) with a governmental ministry or agency, as in the case of the CIE's Thailand program, (b) with another university; (c) with a private voluntary organization; or (d) directly with villagers, as was initially the case in the Ecuador project. In Ghana the PEA, a voluntary nonformal

education association, was related to the University of Ghana's IAE both historically and through the IAE provision of the salary for the Executive Secretary of the PEA. Consequently three institutions--the CIE, IAE and PEA were inevitably involved in this project; and the dynamics and vacillations between each pair in the triangle were a factor in the evolution of the project. For the most part activities with local personnel and villagers occurred through the PEA, though in some respects activities preceded an attempted development of a link between them and the PEA as well as the IAE.

C. Inter-institutional Collaboration

In a project collaboration can be the product of a formal agreement which spells out the respective roles, contributions and benefits at the outset. Or one can start with a collaboration between individuals around specific activities in the hope that these can progressively become the basis of an achieved inter-institutional collaboration. Or again, the whole project can consist of an exploration and demonstration of action alternatives through a collaboration between individuals, with the hope that subsequently these will be taken over by single or collaborating institutions. The Ecuador project was an example of the latter approach. In Ghana the initial intent was to follow the first option through a formal project agreement, but due to developments described in this report the project can most accurately be viewed as an example of the second approach that attempts an achieved inter-institutional collaboration in the course of project activities.

D. Action-based Training Model

Most traditionally the training component of a project involves the selection of a group of trainees who are sent to an educational institution for formal training with the expectation that they will return to work more effectively in the program. In some cases training starts with in-country workshops for existing personnel. For the most part training in this project, as in Ecuador, occurred in the first instance around working with individuals and groups on specific tasks. Subsequently there were short training workshops, often as a spin-off from activities and sometimes as a segment of an existing meeting called for other purposes. The only training provided for Ghanaians at the University of Massachusetts took the form of short internships for three leaders during the project, and here the training was mutual in the sense of sharing knowledge and competencies in the context of working on problems of program development.

E. Short-term Staffing

In an overseas project, the central field staff from an American university may, as was the case in Ecuador, remain on the site for an extended and continuous period over several years. Or in situations where there is sufficient infrastructure and resources in the indigenous program, and the project is run by local personnel, there may be brief consulting or training visits from the outside. In this case however the initiation of project activities depended upon UMass field personnel who were in Ghana for relatively short periods. Over two years there were three successive people from UMass responsible for coor-

dinating the project and three others who worked on sub-projects for overlapping periods. During this time there were several Ghanaians who worked directly with UMass personnel, either as volunteers or with some form of payment, and one who was an intern sent to UMass before returning as a salaried staff member. There were various reasons for the emergence of this staffing program, ranging from budgetary constraints that meant minimal payments to staff in a highly inflationary economy, to personal time limitations of those who were qualified and available to go to the field.

F. Multiple Small Projects

A project for educational development often denotes a single program with integrated activities directed towards a common overall goal. Such a project may be large in scale with numerous components, or more limited on both counts. In this case, however, as in Ecuador, the "project" was in effect a series of small projects developed by individuals that elicited the participation of others, that had different foci and content, and that were exploratory as well as developmental in nature. They were "integrated" only in the sense that they occurred in the same geographical area or site, were derived from a similar set of principles, involved interaction in team meetings, and were related in various ways to the PEA.

The nature of the different phases of this project as a whole, as well as of the particular sub-projects or action components, was strongly influenced by such contextual features as well as by the characteristics of individual project members. The first six months were devoted

to site exploration, negotiations, and the initiation of work with the wayside mechanics group, an indigenous vocational training program. In the next six months more extensive contacts with the PEA were developed, village development assistance and rural facilitator training were begun, and then help with extending the educational potential of existing cultural groups was inaugurated. The subsequent six-month period was characterized by an effort to provide a better balance between IAE and PEA links and starting activities in the area of adult literacy. In the last six months of the project procedures were improved and sub-projects consolidated with the help of a visit by a UMass faculty member. Towards the end of this period participant assessments were undertaken and arrangements were made to facilitate the transition and funding to allow the PEA to continue what was begun.

The numerous individuals who made major contributions to the project include staff members of the PEA, IAE and CIE; voluntary members of the PEA in many communities in the Eastern Region of Ghana; and the facilitators, cultural group leaders, fitters and all others who gave their wisdom and time toward the goal of making this program their program for their own communities. These efforts were supplemented by various types of support from graduate students at the Center in UMass and officials in USAID, as well as governmental and international agency personnel in Ghana.

Bernard Wilder served as AID Washington liaison with the project and made several trips to Ghana during the period covered by this report.

The leaders of the three organizations involved in the program at

the time of its inception were T.K. Hagan, President of the PEA; Joe Opare-Abetia, former Executive Secretary of the PEA; Emmanuel Ampene, former Director of the IAE; and David R. Evans, Director of the CIE.

Project personnel, whose names appear in this report, include those who served in Ghana and those who worked primarily at UMass. In Ghana the field directors or administrators representing the Center were, successively, Felix McGowan, Ramoshebi Ishmael Moletsane, and Janice Smith. Other Center members who served on the field team were Stephen McLaughlin, Robert (Bro) Russell, Elvyn Jones-Dube, and Linda Abrams. Vidal Quist, Vice-Chairman of the Koforidua PEA Branch, was the principal PEA member on the project team, which also included J.K. Hanson and Fanny Dontah, among others. At the CIE in Umass, David Kinsey was the Principal Investigator of the Project and John Bing was its Administrator. Nana Seshibe was the coordinator of the Site Support Group, which included Linda Abrams, John Bing, David Kinsey, George Urch, and June Bourbeau.

This report may be read as a whole or in sections. This introduction and the concluding chapter (VII) summarize general issues and observations about what has been learned about them. The chapter on the overview of the project (I) and the experiment in collaborative program development (II) may be read together as a unit. And the chapters on the sub-projects (III-VI) deal with the rationale, description and possible insights related to each action component, and may be looked at separately according to the reader's interest.

Just as the nature of this project was affected by the characteristics of its participants and involved continual dialogue, this report

also reflects individual interpretations and differences. In attempting to retain this dialogical texture we hope the reader will be encouraged to participate with us in understanding and learning from this experiment.

CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW OF PROJECT

George Urch
Nana Seshibe

CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW OF PROJECT

A. Project Purpose and Nature

Over the past four years the growth of the University of Massachusetts' Center for International Education's Nonformal Education Program has significantly strengthened its capacity to create, develop and field-test a wide range of techniques and materials for nonformal education. The development of the program was made possible by a five-year grant from the Technical Assistance Bureau of the United States Agency for International Development (AID). The 211(d) AID grant is an "Institutional Grant" which is designed to increase the capability of the university to assist collaboratively developing countries, particularly in rural areas, with development-oriented nonformal education programs.

As a result of the Grant, faculty, graduate students and associates of the University and the Center are to be able to offer expertise in nonformal education theory and practice in the areas of training, research, materials development and delivery systems. A network of human and material resources has been identified which encourages programs for the promotion of skills and knowledge in such areas as family health and nutrition, agricultural productivity, literacy and numeracy, and the development of community and cooperative organizations, both through direct projects and through graduate and intern training programs.

In seeking the Grant, the Center for International Education formulated a definition of nonformal education and structured three guiding assumptions for the emerging program. The working definition of nonformal education was:

> a wide range of non-school activities whose major purpose is to promote in people around the world the development of skills, knowledge and behaviors which will enable them to improve their life situations.

An emphasis was to be placed on creating a development process for nonformal education which could be applied in different localities, rather than attempt to transfer specific techniques and materials. Three guiding principles which were designed to characterize the nonformal education activities were:

1) a reliance on field-based development and testing of proposed techniques;
2) early and continuous direct participation by people who are representative of the people and countries for which the approaches are being developed;
3) a willingness to explore ideas and approaches that initially seem strange or inappropriate.

The Center for International Education felt that a culturally diverse staff, extensive reliance on early and substantial field involvement, and the resultant contacts with people and institutions in developing countries, would help to provide an effective and a reality-oriented means of developing the competencies of the personnel and the resources of the University in tne area of nonformal education.

Toward this end it would be necessary to develop, very early in the

program, a field site based on the collaborative model. The definitions of collaboration in reference to field-site development evolved over a period of time as the Center endeavored to be guided by these principles and the realization that the old "donor-receiver" model of assistance was no longer workable. This model had become synonymous with that of a colonial mentality and oppression, and did not recognize the fundamental interdependence of nations. The emerging collaborative model was based on the belief that a healthy interdependence of nations, institutions and people requires both competition and cooperation. The process in the model requires shared information and financing which extends to the creation of special techniques and methods as well as the training of personnel. The model also suggests that institutions and people with different goals and objectives may find a sufficiency of common objectives to warrant joint programming while separately implementing other objectives. Needed was a field site to help test the conceptual framework of the collaborative model.

B. Nature of Participating Organizations

There were primarily three participating institutions which interacted directly with one another during the development of the Ghana site. The nature and amount of interaction varied as did the collaborative relationship among the three. The participating institutions were:

University of Massachusetts' Center for International Education

University of Ghana's Institute of Adult Education

The People's Education Association of Ghana

1. University of Massachusetts' Center for International Education

The Center for International Education has been involved in the process of education development for the past eight years in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The Center consists of approximately fifty fellows, both faculty and graduate students, who come from the United States and nations throughout the world.

During the past six years the Center has been particularly active in the field of nonformal education and has undertaken a variety of activities which emphasize the development and implementation of new approaches to non-school education in rural areas. The approaches focus on the development of techniques and materials which emphasize local participation and local control of educational activities. The Center has particularly pioneered the use of educational games in combination with dialogue and discussion techniques which have been designed to help learners analyze and work toward the solution of problems in their own lives.

2. University of Ghana's Institute of Adult Education

The Institute is a University department which is engaged in a variety of adult education programs throughout Ghana. These programs range from correspondence studies to extension classes for upgrading to the organization of conferences and workshops for specific target groups. Each region in Ghana has representatives of the Institute in residence. The headquarters is located on the main campus of the University in Legon. The Institute is the sponsoring organization for the People's

Education Association. As the parent organization, it supplies a National Secretary for the PEA and regional officers, who are supposed to work closely with PEA officials at the local level.

3. The People's Educational Association of Ghana

This association has a history which dates back to 1949. During most of its history the PEA was associated with university extension efforts and helped develop educational activities aimed primarily at the relatively well-educated Ghanaians. Local branches were developed throughout the country to assist in these efforts. Since 1973 the focus of concern has been a desire to involve the local branches more directly in the development of their own communities. In order to promote community development, members of the local PEA's--primarily composed of volunteers who are the educated people in a village--are involved in organizing self-help projects. The PEA is a national organization, with regional and local officers. The Institute of Adult Education assists the PEA through their regional offices.

The Center for International Education was invited to work with the PEA's in the Eastern Region of Ghana. They were assisted by the two officers from the Institute of Adult Education based in Koforidua, the capital of the Eastern Region. These two officers were: Mr. K.A. Oduro, Senior Resident Tutor and Mr. Lawrence Okraku, Senior Organizer. (Mr. Okraku was recently appointed Executive Secretary of the PEA.) Also of vital assistance in setting up the NFE Program in the Eastern Region were the President of the National PEA, who lived in Koforidua and Mr. Vidal K. Quist, Vice-Chairman of the Koforidua PEA Branch. Mr.

Quist was a valuable team member who worked closely with the Center staff.

C. Sequence of Events

1. Initial Organization

The Nonformal Education Program Grant called for a field site which would help to increase the quality of the Center's capacity to develop and implement skills and knowledge in NFE which would be based upon the concerns of education and developers in cooperating countries. The need for the field site was also based on the Center's premise that research in nonformal education can most effectively be developed through collaborative efforts with cooperating groups.

As the NFE Program began to unfold, a Conceptualization Task Force within the NFE community was organized to help provide a foundation for suggesting priorities in site selection, training and materials development based on significant development needs, optimal program types, and the capacity of the Center. Emerging from the Conceptualization Group was a tentative list of suggested criteria for site selection. This list was given to the African, Asian and Latin American Regional Groups organized within the Center's NFE Program.

The African Regional Group worked closely with members of the Conceptualization Task Force to refine the criteria for site selection. Eventually the criteria which emerged were categorized in four major areas. These were:

a. National Situation

(1) Relationship of site program to national goals and Center guidelines

(2) Commitment to people's self-reliance goals

(3) Creating/willing to create its own institution on NFE

(4) Language of central personnel in country known to Center and UMass participants.

b. Program Conditions and Relationships

(1) Opportunity for symmetrical relationships (cooperative relations and mutual benefits)

(2) Interested in learner-centered, self-help, responsive and facilitator elements

(3) Existing program infrastructure (operating program, personnel) and evidence of long-term viability

(4) Design and conditions allow expansion or replicability for larger population

(5) Program oriented to significant development needs

(6) Local opportunities for individuals to use awareness/skills of NFE program (providing basis for individual motivation, relation to other development efforts, etc.)

(7) Actual/potential link within country between program and professional resource base (e.g., that can also benefit from outside assistance and provide on-going professional support to local NFE program).

c. Fit Between Local Needs and Center Capacity

(1) Some significant program needs (content, skills, etc.) that are compatible with Center (plus UMass and alumni) capacity, e.g., Facilitator training, Materials & technique development, Formative evaluation)

d. Communication & Support Options

(1) Distance and/or funding opportunities that allow for frequent and continuous contact

(2) Program or government willing to share some of the costs

(3) Options for counterpart relationship.

2. Site Exploration and Selection

In January 1975 a two-person team[1] from the Center visited four African countries at their invitation to determine the possibility of developing a collaborative field site. The countries were Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho and Senegal. After the report of the team and extensive discussions with all people involved with the NFE Program, it was suggested that a second team return to Ghana to explore further the possibilities of site development in that nation.

During July-August, 1975, a three-person team[2] visited Ghana and reported back to the NFE community the possibility of working collaboratively with four organizations: (1) the Ghana YMCA, a private voluntary organization, which was involved in the development of a Model Farm Project in the Volta Regi!n; (2) the Aburi District Council, Eastern Region, a local government organization, which was working with three isolated villages; (3) the Ghanaian Government's Department of Game and Wildlife in the Northern Region, which was interested in training Game Park Officers for community development; and (4) the People's Educational Association (PEA), a voluntary organization at the village level organized by the University of Ghana's Institute of Adult Education to encourage community development.

After further correspondence with Ghana, and extensive discussions with the NFE community, a decision was made to further explore the possibility of developing a collaborative relationship with the People's

---

[1]Nana Seshibe, George Urch.

[2]Nana Seshibe, Carol Martin, George Urch.

Education Association and its parent institution, the Institute of Adult Education (IAE). This additional exploration was considered necessary to determine what activities the Center's NFE community could undertake in Ghanaian communities which would meet stated NFE goals, complement PEA goals and activities, and strengthen the concept of mutuality and collaboration. Toward that end the NFE Program sent two people to Ghana.

In January, 1976, Dr. David R. Evans, Director of the CIE, and Professor Felix McGowan, the Project Coordinator, went to Ghana to begin to develop a mutually beneficial relationship between the Center's NFE community and the PEA/IAE. This Center team met with Dr. Ampene, Director of the Institute of Adult Education, and Mr. Joseph Opare-Abetia, National Secretary of the PEA. They also made visits to regional and branch sites of the PEA/IAE. Among the people they met was Mr. K.A. Oduro, Senior Resident Tutor of the IAE for the Eastern Region and based in the town of Koforidua. Mr. Oduro was responsible for supporting PEA activities in his region.

Emerging from these meetings was a "Proposal for Collaboration Between the People's Educational Association/Institute of Adult Education and the Center for International Education of the University of Massachusetts." The proposal was based on discussions between the Center team and members of the staff of the PEA/IAE based at the University of Ghana in Legon and in the Eastern Region. In order to encourage cooperation between the two institutions the proposal suggested that initial efforts be concentrated in two areas: (1) the development of a village facilitator PEA branch model for rural settings; and (2) the

development of an evaluation system for the pilot projects and assistance in carrying it out to produce case studies.

The proposal recommended that consideration be given to finding a cluster of villages which would be willing to participate in the development and testing of a range of NFE materials and techniques which would be created for the setting. These villages could serve as pilot projects. The activities in each village would vary depending on need and interest and could include a mixture of development projects--water, health, agriculture, and educational activities--literacy, numeracy, planning skills, and problem solving.

To implement the proposal Professor McGowan began an exploratory phase to identify potential sites and leaders within the PEA. The exploratory phase included meetings with officials from the Institute of Adult Education and the PEA to help clarify the concept of a collaborative model within the framework of nonformal education. Professor McGowan was joined in February, 1976 by Stephen McLaughlin, a doctoral research student who was to begin to gather data.

Back at the Center a Site Support Group was organized under the direction of the Coordinator of the Africa Regional Group. The Site Support Group was formed to support and facilitate site development, and to respond to correspondence and requests from the field. The Group was also to serve as a liaison between the site and the overall NFE community at the Center.

The Center team in Ghana eventually selected the Eastern Region as its main base. It was found that the PEA was more active, at that time, in this region than anywhere else in the country. Mr. Oduro also encour-

aged the UMass team to work in the Eastern Region and to reside in Koforidua, the capital of the Eastern Region. Another deciding factor was that the National President of the PEA resided in Koforidua.

3. Phases of Project Development

The activities undertaken in the Eastern Region during the course of the project are discussed in detail in later chapters. For the purpose of giving an overview of their sequence they may be viewed as occurring in four phases.

Phase I (January-July, 1976), which involved preliminary groundwork with the IAE and National PEA, and the initiation of the Fitters project. After the decision to base the site in and around Koforidua, and numerous personal contacts with the IAE and PEA, Felix McGowan arranged for Mr. K.A. Oduro and Mr. N. Tettey, a PEA member, to visit the Center for International Education in April-May to explore ways a collaborative model could begin to be developed. One result of this visit was to begin arrangements for a Center member to work with Cultural Groups in the Eastern Region. Following his initial study of the Wayside Fitters apprenticeship program in Koforidua, Steve McLaughlin initiated developmental activities with this group that continued throughout the project.

Phase II (September 1976-January 1977), which focused on improving links with the PEA and initiating the Village Facilitator and Cultural Group projects. Ishmael Moletsane involved the IAE and National PEA in the selection of six villages for the facilitator work, and together with Mr. Vidal Quist and the Koforidua PEA began activities with

these villages. Bro Russell started working with cultural groups in villages near Koforidua, an activity which also extended throughout the project. Also during this period, Vidal Quist spent time at the Center for International Education for a collaborative study of program development ideas. He returned as the central Ghanaian team member in the project, and assumed primary responsibilities for the field work on the Village Facilitator project.

Phase III (February-June, 1977), which emphasized development of links with the IAE and included the initiation of the Learner-Centered Literacy program. As the other field projects continued, Jan Smith was concerned with an increased involvement of the IAE in the project and facilitated new program activities in the area of literacy.

Phase IV (July-December, 1977), which was characterized by consolidation, assessment and preparations for close-out. Early in this period Linda Abrams visited the site to assist with training activities and helped improve management and collaborative procedures in the team. Elvyn Jones-Dube carried out assessment interviews with Ghanaians concerning the project. In preparation for continuity following the anticipated departure of UMass personnel, the regional PEA began taking over some tasks and a proposal for funding from AID to allow the PEA to continue to develop these activities was prepared and received the support of the Acting Director of IAE.

CHAPTER II

EXPERIMENT IN COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

John W. Bing
Janice Smith
Vidal Quist

CHAPTER II

EXPERIMENT IN COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

A. The Conduct of Collaboration

This section contains three parts: a discussion of some theoretical considerations of collaborative programs; design issues; and a discussion of specific aspects of the Ghana Nonformal Education program which relate to the issue of collaboration.

1. Background

International cooperative programs have occurred for the duration of the existence of nation-states. They have occurred whenever such cooperation appeared to be beneficial to the parties involved, at least more beneficial than conflict or the lack of any relations whatsoever. Of course, nations throughout history have had more experience with conflict than with collaboration, the latter confined in the main to nations which joined together in larger blocs to gain momentary advantage over a common enemy.

Over the recent past, there has been a growing belief in certain quarters that there are specific common enemies which afflict humanity as a whole and must be confronted by nations together. These conditions are well known. They include hunger, pollution, energy problems, economic disparities, danger of nuclear disorders, over-population and so on. It is clear, for example, that the most sophisticated and well-trained army is no match to a seaborne invasion of oil, and it is

equally clear that this is the type of problem that must be solved internationally.

Perhaps most important is a growing belief among policy planners, politicians, and other decision-makers in industrialized nations that colonialism has become increasingly disadvantageous to all sectors of a rapidly evolving interdependent world. In this view, world economic health is not achievable through the exploitation of one group of nations by another, but rather through the concurrent development of all sectors. Continued economic, educational and other imbalances are perceived as a symptom of international illness which threatens all. These views have been generally held for some time by third-world nations. Whether or not such philosophy would in fact dominate future trends in international relations can only be guessed at and will probably depend upon whether or not most nations can agree that enlightened self-interest depends upon the general welfare of all nations.

Here a distinction must be made. Those countries which have not reached certain minimum levels of economic development will always concentrate on securing such a level before they are able to participate with other nations toward the solution of common problems.

Another distinction is also useful here. The common problems listed above are not currently confined to capitalist, socialist, communist, or third-world countries or to any particular bloc of nations. They have been and continue to be exacerbated by political disputes, and by all colonial enterprises, since colonialism inevitably leads to exploitation of peoples and to the exacerbation of the problems mentioned above.

These problems are nevertheless fairly widespread throughout the

world, although not uniformly distributed. They seem more related to the level of industrialization than they do to political systems.

An analogy to the economic relationships among trading nations exists. Nations with somewhat similar economic levels are generally strengthened by balanced trading with each other, since the increased market allows for expansion of each country's output of goods and services. However, within such broadened markets there are also sectors from each country that will be hurt by the outside competition. These sectors usually demand tariffs to protect their markets, but such steps can set off a trade war, as happened among western nations during the 1930s. With diminished markets, the levels of outputs of goods falls generally, harming each nation's economy.

Such an analysis risks oversimplification of complex world economic factors, and it should be emphasized that trade between economically strong and weak nations generally results in comparative advantage to the powerful trading parties, which can set prices and control shipping and financing instruments.

However, it appears that in both the economic and the problem-identification models, there is a synergistic effect caused by mutual positive activity. Ruth Benedict has written of this concept in terms of societies of high and low synergy, the former described as instances where individuals and institutions "by the same act and by the same time serve [their] own advantage and that of the group"; and "low synergy where the social structure provides for acts which are mutually

opposed and counteractive."[1] Applying this concept to the economic and problem-identification models, synergistic situations may be defined as those in which an agent, acting internationally, assists both itself and the other group. This is particularly interesting in that this definition has much in common with Robert Trivers' concept of reciprocal altruism, where it is argued that for both individuals and groups "under certain conditions natural selection favors these altruistic behaviors because in the long run they benefit the organism performing them."[2]

Trivers' studies of a number of species including humans trace the evolutionary development of altruistic behaviors. As he points out, this indicates science may be verifying the practical benefits of "do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

Perhaps the simplest formulation of the above ideas is that cooperation or collaboration between two or more parties is only possible when they all perceive that they have something to contribute to and to gain from the results of such activity. Further, the perception of potential contribution and of benefits from such joint activities depends on whether cooperation or competition is perceived as the most effective method for achieving a goal. Mutual exploitation can too easily become simple exploitation when an imbalance of power occurs. It is our premise that over a long period of time inequality of power leads to exploitation; rough equality to cooperative behavior.

---

[1]Quoted in Abraham H. Maslow, The Farther Reaches of Human Nature (New York: Viking Press, 1971), p. 202.

[2]See R. Trivers, "The Evolution of Reciprocal Altruism," Quart. Dev. Biology, 46:35-57.

Certain political analysts[1] have described international power relationships as reflecting either traditional power-dominant or interdependence forms. The latter are predicated to be the result of multiple channels connecting societies; the absence of hierarchy among issues relating to states; and the absence of the use of threat of military force in the region. Under these conditions, leverage between states is distributed more evenly allowing cooperative (as opposed to coerced) behavior to develop.

If it is true, and this is only a premise, that interdependent behaviors are increasing across national boundaries, then international collaborative programs are likely to increase among entities between these states. This is the principal reason that the staff of the Nonformal Education Program of the Center for International Education believe in the value of an exploration of the anatomy, design, implementation and effects of such programs.

2. Context

This section will deal with the question of why the Center for International Education at the University of Massachusetts (hereafter designated as UMass) attempted to develop a NFE collaborative program with the People's Education Association (PEA) of the Eastern Region, Ghana, and the Institute of Adult Education (IAE) of the University of Ghana.

---

[1] See especially Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, Power and Interdependence (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1977).

a. Nature of the Center for International Education

Since its inception in 1968, the Center has become steadily more international in its composition, with the membership currently around 40 percent non-U.S. citizens. This has led to an increasing interest and capability in the development of international programs. Two particular program areas have been stressed: Nonformal Education and Collaborative Programs.

b. The Nonformal Education Program in Ecuador

The Nonformal Education Program in Ecuador was the first effort of the Center to employ both nonformal education contents and collaborative processes. Some important aspects of this program included the use of multinational staffing patterns, the development of the facilitator model for implementing nonformal education; the use of educational games, fotonovelas, radio and a traveling educational fair (bibliobus) as techniques in the application of nonformal education. The Ecuador Project had as a major focus a process goal "how to generate processes that fostered the phenomena of transformation rather than pure modernization."[1] Nonformal Education and all the allied techniques were therefore utilized in the service of this goal, in the context of work with Ecuadorian campesinos and other groups.

Throughout this program, participative methodologies were stressed, so that project staff would not automatically fall into the traditional role of knowledge-giver and others involved in the

---

[1]See Nonformal Education in Ecuador, 1971-1975 (Amherst: Center for International Education, 1975), p. 19.

program would not become mere knowledge-takers. The report of this program stated that the project staff involved themselves in their work "more as men and women in the process of development than as professionals who had all the answers."[1]

The staff of the Ecuador Project, then, was concerned both with structural changes and with implementing the program through joint participation with Ecuadorian campesinos and others. In addition, a number of useful techniques and methods for the delivery of NFE were developed.

c. The Nonformal Education Grant

During the final phases of the Ecuador Project, the Center received a grant from the Agency for International Development to strengthen its competence in nonformal education for the developing world. The purpose of the grant was "to increase the capability of the University of Massachusetts to assist collaboratively developing countries, particularly in rural areas, with development-oriented nonformal education programs."[2] The document speaks of a "collaborative effort" with the individuals and organizations in developing countries and of assuring "mutual respect and mutual learning."[3] These priorities grew from developments made possible by the Ecuador Program. In addition, several methodologies were later adapted from the Ecuador Program.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 16.

[2] "Proposal for Support under the Agency for International Development Institutional Grant Program" (Amherst: C.I.E., 1974), p. 14.

[3] Ibid., p. 17.

The staff that planned and worked on the early development of the Center's nonformal education grant[1] was an international group that wanted to test the concept of collaboration in international programs, as well as various aspects of nonformal education. No doubt their experience at the Center influenced the kind of program that eventually took place. One significant change was a shift from the concern with structural changes to collaboration with a host-country organization. This meant that the programs were less directly focused on political issues and more on working with local institutions in nonformal education areas. Basically, this should have removed the UMass team from decisions regarding local political issues by having these decisions made by the collaborating organizations themselves. This was partially achieved, but not surprisingly, the result was to involve the program more closely in local institutional relationship issues.

One reason for this shift, which was subtle and gradual, was the ethical problem that all outside facilitators have in making or encouraging decisions, the consequences of which rebound to the internal groups. Many Center members believed that it should not be the role of the Center to point out "structural" contradictions in other people's societies, but rather to serve as tools for change for organizations and groups already involved in this process.

Although the institutional grant to the Center for International Education was to strengthen its own competency to work with "developing"

---

[1]These included Alberto Ochoa, Roshan Billimoria, David R. Evans, Nana Seshibe, John Bing, Patricio Barriga, Jim Mangan, Kotcho Dube, Steve McLaughlin, Mose Tjitendero, Valerie Miller, Vasudevan Nair, Jim Theroux, Robin Massee, Jeanne Moulton, George Urch, Carla Clason, Arlen Etling, Robert Russell, Carol Martin.

countries, Center members who were involved with the writing of the grant document made it clear that they believed that any such competency could only be developed and maintained through the creation of programs carried out directly with such people and organizations. This belief is reflected in the language of the grant document, that activities would be based on "a reliance on field-based development and testing of proposed techniques" and "early and continuous direct participation by people who are representative of the people and countries for which the approaches are being developed."[1]

Since AID institutional grants were usually directed toward the accumulation of research and its utilization with respect to developing countries, the grant to the University of Massachusetts represented somewhat of a change of emphasis in the direction of actual program development.

So far we have discussed the genesis of the Ghana program in ideas developed through the Ecuador Project and in the particular constituency of the Center. One can make a simple hypothesis regarding the development of collaborative programs, viz., that organizations comprising individuals from many ethnic groups and nationalities are more likely to develop collaborative-type programs than those composed of one ethnic and national group, but quite obviously this is not the only significant factor.

Before discussing the schema to be utilized in analyzing aspects of the Ghana program, some final remarks regarding the context of the

---

[1]"Proposal for Support under the Agency for International Development Institutional Grant Program" (Amherst: C.I.E., 1974), p. 16.

program should be made in order to provide the reader with some perspective regarding the common obstacles to development of these types of collaborative programs.

The principal goal of both the Ecuador and Ghana projects was to use resources gathered by the Center, with resources already existing in the respective project areas, jointly to produce learning tools and delivery systems which would be of use to local institutions and individuals.

3. Aspects of Program Design

In a recent volume on collaboration in work settings,[1] Appley and Winder have described collaboration as a value system in opposition to competitive systems. Eric Trist, in the same volume, described the necessity for work restructuring and introducing an interactive and participatory planning process as "mandatory for any productive attempt to bring into being successfully a future that will permit human survival under conditions worth having."[2] It was this basic impulse which led some members of the Center for International Education to develop a trial of the collaborative process.

At the time this experiment was begun, little field work had been documented in the area of collaborative program development; it was not within the scope of this program to test such a developed concept but rather to work together with another institution to build a program with

---

[1] "Collaboration in Work Settings," The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, V:3, p. 11.

[2] Ibid., p. 270.

cooperative characteristics from which collaborative characteristics could be inferred and the outline of a paradigm could be developed. We intended to try to develop a cooperative program, believing such a program type points in the direction in which international programs must evolve. There was a general belief that such a program type must be developed inductively at least as much as it was deductively; that as much could be learned from field-testing ideas as could be learned from manipulating general propositions.

It is worth exploring certain areas of agreement and disagreement among staff with which the program began. There was general agreement that technical assistance and foreign aid in general had, over the past two decades, at least not impeded the development of inequality and asymmetry between and among industrialized and non-industrialized states; that such programs had in general been administered in ways which accentuated the power of the giver and the weakness of the receiver for such aid; and that programs of true mutual or collaborative assistance would have to be developed in order to make symmetrical relationships possible. Implicit in this reasoning was the idea that collaborative relationships increase the welfare of both parties, and "permit human survival under conditions worth having."

At the same time, there was a small group which believed that accepting funds from AID precluded the possibility of genuinely collaborative programs in the international sphere. Sentiment was approximately divided along economic/conceptual lines, with those favoring a Marxist interpretation believing in the impossibility of the development of collaborative programs through AID funding. As with all closely

held belief systems, the adherents thereof had no difficulty picking out heros and villains. AID was the villain, for supporting repressive regimes and for not supporting revolutionary ones; UMass was the villain's stooge for accepting tainted funds. A series of running attacks was made on the 211(d) program at UMass in its earliest stages through local newspapers and by one individual within the Center. The program was defended by members of the Center, in the case of third-world members, at no small cost to their reputations. It was generally defended on the grounds that since the money came in the form of a grant rather than a contract, fewer restrictions were placed on how or where it was to be used. The latter arguments prevailed. In retrospect, more emphasis might well have been placed on the real challenge--that of developing and evaluating such a program.

a. Assumptions

There were a number of implicit and explicit assumptions that laid the groundwork for the Ghana NFE program. These included:

(1) The belief that small programs are more participative than large, capital intensive programs. This was, of course, making a virtue of necessity, but was nevertheless a belief closely held by many members of the Center. Included in the concepts of humaneness and "relevance" are the increased level of influence of individuals in smaller units. By corollary, smaller groups are more easily influenced than larger ones; hence, Center members saw themselves as more tractable, less dangerous than representatives of larger bureaucracies, the latter with more power to do harm to local groups and conse-

quently with less constraints on their behavior. There was also perhaps a hint of concern that since Center members as a whole did not believe that they were in command of the entire truth of development, they did not believe that they were entitled to impose one conception on any cooperating group. Being small helped.

(2) All of us, brought up as we were on personal knowledge of the dangers of the imposition of one group over another, were willing to risk the other extreme--that in a reasonable parity of relationship little productive work would be accomplished. Implicit in our beliefs were the necessity of finding a group that operated like ourselves, that believed in some of the same value sets.

(3) Consonant with the belief that the program should fit the people, we believed that the program should be developed around the talent and special interests of our staff. This tended to amplify the effectiveness (and the weaknesses) of individuals in the staff but to reduce proportionately the cohesion of the overall program. Such a program philosophy might be termed organic, that is, developing from the talents of the staff and the interests and needs of the client population.

(4) Central to a collaborative program concept was the concern of using staff both from the Center and from the cooperating institutions, and, by extension, of villagers in the villages themselves. There was a considerable intermixing of

Ghanaian and Center staffs, the result of which tended to localize intercultural problems within the staff itself rather than between the staff and the cooperating groups. While at times such problems grew to be serious, they never overwhelmed the project.

(5) A belief that the cooperating groups should jointly define program objectives. This proved very difficult initially when, combined with a natural and common suspicion among the program's hosts, it produced the widely held suspicion that the program was a CIA front. (It should be pointed out here that some blame for this state of affairs must be placed on an intelligence community which has notably failed to reassure the rest of the world that it does not naturally involve itself in enterprises of this type. Legitimate organizations are consequently suspect.)

(6) That the Center's reserve of skills, methods and techniques in Nonformal Education would prove useful to and compatible with organizations and individuals working in rural areas. This was the content area of the Ghana program. A short-hand summation of the program would thus describe it as a venture which depended on the individual talent of its staff, the content area of Nonformal Education, and the participative devices which lead to collaborative processes.

(7) That, obviously, all concerned groups would gain something from the collaboration. This synergistic development is absolutely essential to the concept of voluntary collaborative

programs. In fact, there were two constraints operating in this particular program. The first was that the Center failed adequately to define what its own objectives (as an organization) were in this project; the second, that in programs where outside facilitators are functioning, those that can gain in a change in the status quo will be those who most enthusiastically support the program, all other things being equal.

b. The Design of the Program

As has been mentioned, the design of the Ecuador Project, which preceded the Ghana Project, was the creation of a multinationally staffed service organization to provide training and curricula in nonformal education to individuals and organizations which requested such services. The program also acted in a semi-autonomous fashion in helping to train a facilitator network in the rural areas of Ecuador.

The NFE program associated with the 211(d) grant had one major feature entirely different from the Ecuador project: it was attached strongly to organizations within Ghana, to the Institute for Adult Education and especially to the People's Education Association of the Eastern Region. The program, unlike the earlier project, never intended to serve a large number of organizations, but rather to work closely only with one. As it turned out, to the extent that the IAE and the PEA are separate organizations, the project worked with them both.

The content area design should be briefly mentioned. It was

the intent of the Center staff to continue development of certain substantive aspects of the Ecuador project, especially those relating to facilitator training, games and simulations as used by village level facilitators, and music and drama, as used by the bibliobus in Ecuador. These were the major content area design elements; but there were others as well.[1]

In the discussion of the design for a collaborative program which follows, readers should note that the design relies both on the actual experience of the Ghana NFE program and on extrapolations from this and other programs mounted by the Center. Where the theoretical outline derived herein differs radically from the actual program, the discrepancy will be addressed at a later point. This procedure has been chosen because a simple historical recounting of the Ghana program would have less generalizability to future programs than a description which incorporates broader features. However, the discrepancies themselves may hold some interest for program developers.

The focus of this chapter is on the design for a collaborative program between cooperating organizations. The overall design is quite simple. It relies on the establishment of a temporary institution whose objectives meets the approval of three groups: the two sponsoring organizations and the client population. The agreement must be made explicitly or implicitly, depending on circumstances, and should refer to issues of procedures (decision making, staffing,

---

[1]See the Ecuador Final Report and the UMass 211(d) Grant document for details.

and so on) as well as content objectives (curriculum development, type of training). All functions require some joint planning.

The temporary project thus meets goals of each sponsoring group. If it does not, then one of the groups will not allow it to come into being (unless one of those groups is coerced).

Shared decision making is made practical and effective through shared staffing. If each of the parent organizations supplies staff to the temporary project, the temporary organization is invested with a more legitimate claim that it is acting in the best interests of both parent organizations, or at least that decisions made in this manner have at least tacit approval of both organizations.

The same is true with respect to the issue of funding. If one of the organizations supplies the entire funding for the joint program, the other is subject to a form of coercion. However, if both contribute funds to the implementation of the project, then the leverage on decision making is likely to be more equitable.

Implicit of course in these equations is the assumption that a balance of control between the two organizations is a prerequisite for collaborative activity. However, a fundamental analysis of each situation is required because each context has certain unique features that prevent the development of a formula for collaboration. For example, money may not be the significant controlling element in a project of this type. As with most real situations, the controlling elements are a combination of factors. These may include, but are not limited to:

(1) Socio-cultural-political information: How is the web of society woven? Who controls what? What are the relationships between people and how are they determined? Who speaks for whom? How is access obtained to the client population? These are the kinds of questions a foreigner--from any society, in any society--almost always confronts. The shorter the duration of the project, the more important early knowledge of the answers to such questions becomes.

(2) Access to transportation and other logistical problems: Who determines who goes where, when? These practical questions often influence the outcome of a project out of proportion to their apparent importance.

(3) Legal questions: Who issues passports, visas, paychecks, travel approvals? Many will testify to the importance of legal and legal/institutional checks on project activities.

(4) Funding: This has been mentioned and its importance is obvious.

(5) Hiring, promotions, benefits, etc.: Part of the following really, but important enough for its own category.

(6) Decision making: Who exercises decision control within this temporary program? Is there a conscientious effort to develop a style of decision making that furthers collaborative goals? Are both organizations kept informed of program progress?

The control such factors exert on temporary programs varies across programs, depending on conditions such as duration of the project, training of the staff, clarity of objectives, success of pre-planning, access to client population, language problems, and so forth.

To conclude this discussion of major factors affecting collaborative programs, it is necessary to consider certain macro-issues. It is obvious that all institutions, including those involved in international programs of the type we have been discussing, have real or perceived attributes which are a consequence of the society and the nation of which they are a part. Certain professional associa-

tions may have some limited success in surmounting these national attributions but in general the further you are from a society, the more likely that one description will appear to fit all of its parts.

The preconditions of interdependence are crucial here. Some examples may be helpful.

A country which is occupied by a foreign power will have relationships between its native institutions and those of the occupying power. But these cannot be collaborative except in the sense of assisting an enemy, a sense in fact opposite to our definition (of collaboration as cooperation for mutual benefit).

A second case involves an institution from a nation considered unfriendly to a second country which attempts to develop a collaborative program with an institution from that second country. Obviously, the burden of suspicion attendant on these kinds of transactions are such as to prejudice the outcome of such programs before they begin.

All this suggests that there is a certain set of conditions, or a climate, between two countries, which is conducive to the development of collaborative relationships. These include a reasonable level of trust; the existence of multiple channels of communication between the countries, including private as well as governmental sources; the lack of one controlling issue, especially military force, which regulates relations.[1] As the examples

---

[1]Taken in large measure from Keohane and Nye, op. cit., pp. 24-25.

above indicate, the opposite is also true: the use or threat of use of military or economic force produces a climate in which collaborative programs become progressively more difficult.

In addition to these macro-issues, there is one additional area which, while unrelated to local issues, may dominate the possibility of collaborative programs. This includes philosophical or ideological constraints on cooperation. For example, Carter's human rights policy has sometimes operated as a constraint in certain cases where the United States has decided to seriously consider it as an issue. This type of philosophical or policy stance is equally open to either of the potential collaborating institutions, and indeed, in the case of the Center, certain specific policy considerations were adopted in the selection of cooperating institutions. However, the Center decided specifically not to apply these on a country-by-country basis, but rather to view each potential program in the light of these considerations.

c. Implementation Stages of Collaboration Programs

Collaborative programs share certain similarities with other types of temporary programs; but at the same time there are significant differences which require discussion. This discussion (of the construction of collaborative programs) is not by any means definitive, but represents an initial step.

To provide a framework for this discussion, specific idiosyncrasies of collaborative programs will be examined in the context of a generalized description of stages of program development. It should always be remembered that the reason collaborative programs

are distinctive is because they have always at least two antecedents; that is, unlike most other temporary programs, they are formed from and to some degree are dependent upon, two parent organizations. This gives them certain unique characteristics.

COMMON DESIGN STAGES IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Pre-Planning:	Establishment of Program Needs Assessment Resources Assessment	
Planning:	Staffing Staff Training Setting Objectives Scheduling	Benchline Surveys Transportation Housing
Implementation:	Ongoing communication with project staff & communities Develop and sequence program activities Develop materials, training programs, curricula, etc. Periodic formative evaluation Analysis of feasibility of continuing program or program elements	
Evaluation:	Summative, as required	

The above design is primarily for international programs in the education and human resources sector; elements required in capital intensive programs have not been considered.

Each of these areas will be examined to determine how the general design elements are affected by the unique conditions and demands of collaborative programs.

In conventional or unitary programs, the preplanning phase often consist of a determination by a parent agency that it intends to develop a special program for special purposes. This is founded on the belief that the program will meet a need or needs

previously unmet.

(1) Preplanning or Formative Phase of Project Development. The differences between a unitary and a collaborative program are greatest in the early stages of the program. Here, in the conceptual stages of a program, there is a unique difference. In a typical unitary program, a problem (or problems) or goal is defined, assessments of needs and available resources are taken, and the parent organization then outlines a skeletal administrative structure which will undertake project development. The parent organization may allocate its own funds or raise funding from other sources. In any event, in this stage, problem definition is determined by one organization.

A collaborative program begins in a radically different manner. One group, one organizational unit, makes a determination that there exists a problem or set of problems or a goal or set of goals which the group cannot solve or achieve alone, or that can better be solved or achieved in collaboration with another group. There exists at the very outset, therefore, these two very different approaches to problem-solving. In the case of the unitary organization approach, the group identifies, at least implicitly, that (1) a problem or goals exists and (2) that the group had or can get the resources to achieve the goal or solve the problem more or less on its own. If this organization is in competition with other organizations to meet goals or needs, it determines that it can best survive by attempting to achieve its objectives alone.

The initial psychology is quite different, and reflects the basic positions of independence and interdependence. Of course, there may be three entirely different contexts which determine the type of approach that could best be utilized, and members of an organization considering a set of problems or goals should engage in analyses to determine which potential course to undertake. The three possible approaches are:

(a) That the problem or goal is soluble or achievable without requiring the major sharing of resources, information, skills, or knowledge with any other group, i.e., that the organization can act alone. This conclusion is not as common as may at first appear.

(b) That the goal to be achieved or problem to be solved can be achieved only (or more effectively or rapidly) with a degree of cooperation of another group. This of course can be variable, from only a modicum of support (of resources, information, skills or knowledge) to a substantial level of support.

(c) That the program to be solved is insoluble or goal to be achieved is beyond reach for any number of reasons, either in a unitary or collaborative fashion.

Each context must be studied to determine which analysis is most likely to yield results.

Within the past five years, many involved in international programs have tended toward analyses which view groups as having interlocking problems and goals, that is, not susceptible of independent solutions or achievement. The most obvious example, perhaps, is the question of security among the major powers. The adherents of realpolitik (or military superiority) have given way to those that presume security to be achievable through joint action such as arms limitation;

the doctrines of military superiority are increasingly untenable. But many more examples obtain, some mentioned above, and include the health of the world order, just distribution of economic resources, issues of environment and ecology, population growth, and the like.

Within such contexts, collaborative programs are an outgrowth of an analysis showing the world to have such interdependent functions; that is to say, they are special cases of interdependence; they are specific points at which the mechanisms of interdependence take place.

It is during the earliest phase of program development that the analyses occur which determine whether the program will be unitary, collaborative, or a combination of the above. Such analyses are dependent on what conditions dominate the relations between the countries involved; that is to say, whether or not conditions favor the growth of interdependence. Further, the analyses are based on the nature of the task to be performed and the kinds of resources needed. It is not unlikely that conditions may favor increasing numbers of collaborative programs as conditions of interdependence increase.

Finally, staff of each organization involved in collaborative programs must make decisions at this point about the amount and type of resources to be devoted to the program. Very often this may differ according to both the capabilities and limitations of each organization. Those that complement each other in varying ways will have the greatest chance for a

successful working relationship.

(2) Planning Phase of Project Development

This phase of a project also differs considerably between unitary and collaborative projects. Unitary projects require staff which meet criteria primarily related to job proficiency; that is, the problem is matching job requirements with the skills and knowledge of potential staff.

International collaborative programs face more complicated staffing problems. To begin with, as mentioned earlier, parent organizations can more efficiently and legitimately sanction decision making if the collaborative program contains staff chosen from both groups. Alternatives might be separate approval of major decisions by each separate organization, but this is a cumbersome and time-consuming operation; equally unsatisfactory is sandwiching of organizational personnel so that the staff from one group works entirely for another. In this case it is difficult to foresee cooperative decision making taking place.

Secondly, international collaborative programs must draw upon staff with skills and knowledge to work in the culture, language and interests of the client population. This would also suggest the necessity for mixing staff of the two parent organizations.

The setting of specific project objectives should be a function of a thorough staff training program. In unitary programs with educational components, it is at this point that

wise program managers often solicit the assistance of representatives of client populations. In collaborative programs, the objective-setting process is in addition the time at which the different agenda of the two groups become reconciled and merge into a new identity, a program both derived and distinct from the parent organizations. In what context such objective-setting occurs depends upon the complexity of the program. Highly complex, large programs may require more formal processes than smaller ones, but this is true of both unitary and collaborative programs. Objective-setting is a crucial time for all temporary programs, but with collaborative programs it also carries the burden of reconciling varying agendas.

With the area of logistics (scheduling, benchline surveys, transportation and the like), we come to an area in which collaborative international programs may have definite advantages over unitary projects. The combination of resources, skills, knowledge, and capabilities drawn from the two organizations may solve logistic problems with greater success with either imported ignorance or native frustration.

(3) Program Implementation

With the implementation of the program, collaborative programs will tend to behave more like unitary programs. There are certain aspects which will continue to be distinctive, including:

(a) Communications

Project staff will probably find it necessary to keep both parent organizations informed of project development issues. Similarly these organizations must remain in communication with each other.

(b) Approvals

Depending upon the requirements of the parent organizations, fiscal and other types of approvals may also have to be sought from dual sources. Generally, the amount of autonomy that can be granted the field staff in implementing the agreed-upon objectives, the more will be accomplished.

(c) Reports and formative evaluation

Project reports and periodic evaluations should be made to both organizations in a manner determined in the planning phase of program development.

(d) Analysis of feasibility of continuing program or program elements

To the extent that this question requires the addition of resources, this requires the joint action and agreed-upon recommendation of both parent organizations.

(e) Other elements which affect the development of collaborative programs

--Personalities of staff
--Difficulty of program objectives
--Language/cultural differences between staffs and between client population
--Lack of agreement between parent organizations
--Political constraints in carrying out project objectives.

B. Comments by Staff and Associates on the Collaborative Process

1. What We Have Learned About Collaboration--Janice Smith

a. That small programs are more participative and relevant than large, capital-intensive programs

The interviews with the people working in rural communities

revealed whole-hearted support and appreciation for the programs we developed with and for them. The time and energy local people voluntarily invested, without any material reward coming from us, testifies directly to their perception that our programs were humane and relevant to them.

However, there are also some moral problems with coming in with little money and for a short time.

Did we just raise people's expectations and then drop them? There was real concern when we left about what cound be sustained without funding. It was also increasingly apparent that not only is money power, but the prestige and influence outsiders bring to a rural setting is not to be underestimated. In the minds of the people, it was unclear how much of what they had accomplished with us could be sustained without outside intervention.

That the "ups" and "downs" of the project depended on the degree to which people felt their best interests were being served testifies to the fact that as a small project we were more easily influenced than a large capital-intensive program.

There was also a problem apparent in the early stages of the program that the project did not meet anyone's expectations. The IAE was used to working with two types of outside organizations: (1) the expatriate organization with money to help establish programs and furnish vehicles and other hardware; (2) the University research program, typified by a professor who comes first followed by a flock of graduate students, who take up everyone's time and energy and often don't even share the results of their research.

The project was neither of these, but in the early stage of project development failed to project a coherent image of its own. This suggests the need to more clearly state objectives, methods and resources at the outset of a collaborative project.

b. That we needed to find a group to work with that operated like ourselves, that believed in the same value sets

The assumption seemed to hold true. To the extent that the organizations we worked with operated as we did and shared our values, collaboration took place and was productive. And where there were different operating styles and different values functioning, collaboration broke down.

On the surface, one would expect the University collaboration between the IAE and the CIE to be successful for just those reasons. However, because of the Center's unique approach, its lack of apparent hierarchy and formality, it ran directly counter to the Ghanaian University system with its strong ties to the British system.

The PEA was closer to the Center's operating mode, as a voluntary organization of peers, dedicated to democratic principles, self-improvement and debate.

c. That the program should be developed around the talent and special interests of our staff

This principle certainly operated in this program. It was most effective in the cases of Bro Russell's work with Cultural Groups and Steve McLaughlin's work with the Wayside Fitters, where one person initiated the activity, and carried it through to com-

pletion. In the opinions of IAE personnel, especially, these two segments of the program were the ones they liked best, probably because there was very little confusion about what was being done and why.

There was some confusion when this principle was applied to the central development of the program, which was supposed to follow the plan laid out in a proposal, and not the special interests and abilities of the person sent to implement the proposal.

What happened was that the three people who held central administrative responsibility for the program over the two-year period were very different in personal style, background and experience. These differences and the differences in circumstance under which each came to Ghana produced three different styles of collaboration.

The first Project Coordinator went to Ghana with collaboration as his major goal. He took a non-directive approach and worked primarily with the Institute. He helped begin research with the Fitters, established Koforidua as the base for the team and identified Cultural Groups as a program area the PEA was interested in having developed, thus paving the way for future development.

But the IAE was confused and frustrated by his insistence that he didn't want to develop any particular program himself. They expected action on the drafted proposal, and he wanted to develop the collaborative relationship first, then get into programming together with the IAE and PEA. He wanted to use the proposal as a starting point for discussion, rather than a starting point for action, especially since it had not been approved by either the IAE or CIE.

In retrospect, it is easy to see why this approach was confusing to the IAE and PEA, because they didn't really know what the Center had to offer or what it was prepared to do. So it was difficult to collaborate without at least some prior agreement about the task at hand to which both were committed.

Ishmael Moletsane, the second Project Coordinator, arrived in the Eastern Region of Ghana three months after the departure of the previous coordinator. It had been decided that waiting for official approval for the collaboration from the IAE was not a useful strategy, and that action with the PEA was what was needed.

He was very clear with the IAE about his desire to implement the proposal without waiting for official approval. He was granted a visa, settled in Koforidua, and hired M.V.K. Quist, a retired civil servant formerly with the Department of Rural Development. The PEA National Secretary identified a group of villages which Moletsane and Quist approached about developing local projects.

His basic mode of collaboration at the village level was to ask the facilitators what they wanted to do and then find a way to assist them to meet their own goals. Within a month of his arrival, program activity had begun with gusto at the local level in collaboration with the PEA in the Eastern Region and with support from the PEA National Secretary.

Janice Smith arrived two weeks before Ishmael Moletsane's departure. At that point, everyone at the Center was happy with the activity Ishmael had initiated and wanted the program consolidated and some provision made for continuity for the program if

possible.

Seeing that the collaboration with the PEA was firmly established in the Eastern Region, she attempted to strengthen the collaboration with the IAE, in the belief that the Institute would be instrumental in providing support for these new PEA activities, as they were the organization through whom all the PEA's financial resources were channeled. The IAE showed added interest once they knew more about what the project was doing, but they were clearly not going to be in a position in December to take over full support of the PEA's new activities.

Then AID showed an interest in funding the PEA to continue and expand NFE activities in the Eastern Region. Because of that and the realization that the collaboration with the PEA was languishing from neglect, the focus was shifted back to the PEA and the program consolidated through greater emphasis on collaboration within the team and with the PEA Regional Executive Committee.

d. <u>That a collaborative program should use staff both from the Center and from the cooperating institutions</u>

There was a mixing of staff from the Center and the PEA, but, unfortunately, not from the IAE. Although there was cooperation with the regional IAE staff, the programs were separate and there was no IAE staff assigned to work directly with the project.

Hopefully, any future collaboration will be based on sufficient trust and shared goals between the IAE, PEA and CIE to warrant the assignment of some IAE staff to work directly with the project.

e. That the cooperating groups should jointly define program objectives

Jointly defining program objectives is the ideal, however, it is very difficult to do without a certain level of trust between the organizations collaborating, and a clear notion of what needs to be done as well as what can be done.

The jointly developed proposal for collaboration could have been considered a joint definition of program objectives, had the Center not been so concerned about official IAE approval of the document, and had it not been so eager to involve the IAE directly in the implementation of the NFE Program.

Working from the proposal, jointly defining program objectives in the Eastern Region with the PEA worked very well. The facilitators in the rural communities were also eager to participate in defining program objectives for their own communities.

f. That the Center's reserve of skills, methods and techniques in NFE would prove useful to and compatible with organizations and individuals working in rural areas

This certainly proved to be a valid assumption as attested to by the level of voluntary support elicited by the project in the communities of the Eastern Region of Ghana and the desire on the part of the IAE, PEA, and facilitators to see these activities continued and expanded.

Of course, it should be pointed out that not all of the techniques and approaches tried were immediately compatible with the Ghanaian organizations and individuals, because many of them were

first developed for rural communities in Ecuador. The really creative and exciting work of the project was in taking a technique or approach developed in Ecuador or elsewhere and adapting it to the Ghanaian context, and if it just didn't fit, discarding it, and developing an approach on the spot with the Ghanaians that they felt was appropriate to their situation.

One real problem we encountered in adapting our approach to the Ghanaian context was that our "bottom up" approach to program development ran counter to the "top down" approach of the government ministries as well as the hierarchical nature of the traditional society.

Basically, our approach was to foster initiative at the local level by responding to needs and desires articulated at the grass roots, without trying to evaluate those needs by our own standards. Rather, we urged the local people to rank order their concerns in terms of importance and then in terms of solvability through their own efforts. Then we supported their choice, and assisted the local people to develop and carry out their own plan of action.

Fortunately, the Eastern Regional Commissioner showed his commitment to the government's articulated policy of encouraging self-reliance, and lent his own support to projects in which local people were willing to contribute initiative and communal labor.

We also were careful to work through the established order of every community in which we worked.

g. That all concerned groups would gain something from the collaboration

This is, of course, the key assumption on which all collaboration rests.

PEA: The proposal for collaboration specified that we would work with the PEA to help it to achieve its goals of more meaningful participation in rural community life.

Support from the PEA was evident at all levels.

(1) The PEA National Secretary was one IAE staff member who was clearly instructed to work with us. He provided official organizational sanction for UMass staff to work in Ghana (letters for visas, etc.). He assisted the project to access resources from the German Adult Education Association for PEA workshops, and made himself available for advice and consultation with the project staff at any time.

(2) The PEA National President happened to reside in Koforidua and, although he received no pay for his work with the PEA or the project, he gave unstintingly of his support, encouragement, advice and time to further the collaboration.

(3) The elected officers of the PEA in the Eastern Region also whole-heartedly supported the project, although as volunteers, their time was limited. For that reason, the project hired two of the officers as project staff.

(4) Local PEA groups and other voluntary organizations approached at the local level were eager to collaborate and put in a tremendous amount of voluntary time and energy.

UMass: UMass certainly needed the PEA, because it could not have worked in Ghana without the official sanction of a Ghanaian organization. And the Center was committed to collaborating with a voluntary organization working directly in rural areas.

IAE: The IAE provided exactly what was called for in the Proposal for Collaboration. They provided sanction for us to work with the PEA, some secretarial support and visas.

Signing a formal agreement and processing that through the University of Ghana would have been a risky proposition for the IAE. The Center didn't have a clear plan of action to present to the IAE. There was legitimate suspicion about our intentions, and if we had turned out to be a subversive organization, the IAE would stand to lose a lot by being associated with us.

Cooperating with us involved other risks for the IAE. They had already had poor experiences with expatriate researchers who took up valuable staff time and gave them nothing in return, not even the results of the research. We could have done the same thing.

Another risk for the IAE was that the UMass NFE Program would raise the expectations of the PEA by pumping a lot of time, energy, and personnel into an area; by creating exciting programs which it would then leave behind for the IAE to pick up and continue. These might even be programs for which IAE staff members had no previous training and little inclination.

Finally, strengthening the PEA would naturally imply a change in the status quo and might alter the relationship between the IAE

and PEA, making the PEA less dependent on the IAE.

2. Historical Development UMass/PEA Products--Ghanaian Perspective

I, Vidal Kwami Quist, the current first Vice-Chairperson of the People's Educational Association in the Eastern Region have held various positions in the People's Educational Association for many years in the Western and Eastern Regions of Ghana. I am the only Ghanaian member of the University of Massachusetts Team and have served the longest period with the project, that is, from September, 1976 to December, 1977.

As a Regional Executive Member of the People's Educational Association in the Western, Northern, and Eastern Regions, the extent of my own involvement with the project was through dialogue with other branch and regional members of the People's Educational Association at both meetings and at workshops on the Nonformal Education Project experiments.

My specific involvement with the project began when M.T.K. Hanson, the National President and the Regional Chairperson of the People's Educational Association, recommended me to Mr. R.I.M. Moletsane and Mr. Steve McLaughlin, both of the University of Massachusetts Program, as the People's Educational Association member with whom they could work on the Nonformal Education Project in the Eastern Region. Before Mr. Moletsane's arrival in Ghana in September, 1976, Mr. Hagan and I were associates of Mr. Felix McGowan, the first coordinator of the University of Massachusetts Program who was in Koforidua from January, 1976 to June, 1976. Mr. Hagan and I had spent considerable time with Mr.

McGowan discussing his plans for the Nonformal Education Program in the Eastern Region.

By virtue of my membership on the Regional Executive Committee of the People's Educational Association and the University of Massachusetts Team, I have had the singular opportunity to serve through the tenure of office of all the three heads of the Nonformal Education Program. I am therefore acquainted with the problems encountered, the successes, and accomplishments of the project.

a. Initiating the Project

I was informed that a team of three members of the staff of the Center for International Education of the University of Massachusetts was at Legon in the summer of 1975 to assess the potential of existing institutions that would like to make use of nonformal education techniques and also to assess the readiness of such institutions to try out the new educational approach. The result of their investigations was a paper entitled "Proposal for Collaboration with the Institute of Adult Education/People's Educational Association and the Center for International Education of the University of Massachusetts," which was written by the team from the Center for International Education and the Senior Resident Tutor of the Institute of Adult Education, who is loaned by the Institute of Adult Education to the People's Educational Association as its National Secretary. He is stationed at Legon. In that paper it was stated how the collaboration amongst the three institutions was to be effected. It was clearly stated that the collaboration would be more with the People's Educational Association and the University

of Massachusetts than with the Institute of Adult Education. This paper on collaboration therefore prompted the Center for International Education to send the first coordinator of the nonformal education program to Ghana in January, 1976. As there appeared to be not much of a history of nonformal education in Ghana, the idea of nonformal education was unfamiliar with the members of the People's Educational Association so they had to be convinced that there was something in nonformal education and that a relationship with the Center for International Educati . would benefit Ghanaians. The Coordinator discussed the concept of nonformal education at the meetings of the People's Educational Association in the country and especially in the Eastern Region. He only talked about it at meetings of the People's Educational Association but did not go very far for delineating any concrete program. What made the concept of nonformal education more incomprehensible to the members of the People's Educational Association was that when the UMass staff was asked for further elucidation, they replied that they had come to assist Ghanaians achieve their own aspirations and to improve the quality of their lives. How they would assist Ghanaians to achieve their aspirations was not made explicit. Some members of the People's Educational Association very much doubted that an outside agency could assist Ghanaians without investment of any equipment and/or money. Others wondered how just talking with Ghanaians would lead to meaningful assistance, assistance to what?

One UMass coordinator appeared to rely heavily on the staff of the Institute of Adult Education for exacting resources but with

the very limited resources of the Institute of Adult Education, he was unable to start any nonformal education program or project. His activities were concentrated in the offices of the Institute of Adult Education at Legon and Koforidua. What I thought also added to his difficulties of starting a program was the lack of permanent lodging.

Because members of the People's Educational Association were at first unable to comprehend the concept of nonformal education and the Coordinator also was unable to get his program off the ground, he arranged for two Ghanaians, Mr. K.A. Oduro, Senior Resident Tutor, of the Institute of Adult Education and Mr. Tetteh, music master for the People's Educational Association at Larteh to go to the Center for International Education at Amherst for six weeks, so that they could return with a better understanding of what was called nonformal education. Another contributing factor to the inability of Mr. McGowan to start any program was probably the absence of Mr. T.K. Hagan, the National President of the People's Educational Association from Koforidua. He was away on nine months' course at the Management and Productivity Institute at Greenhill, Legon. Mr. McGowan conferred with Mr. Hagan whenever he was at Legon, but as Mr. Hagan was in full residence and away from Koforidua, he could not give Mr. McGowan the cooperation and support he would have wished to give him. The return to the United States by the Coordinator of the program made some of the members of the People's Educational Association very suspicious of his activities. They drew the unfortunate conclusion that he might be

a Central Intelligence Agency official who had come to collect information on Ghanaians for subversion by his organization. This suspicion lingered on until the arrival in Ghana of the new director of the Project, Mr. Ramoshebi Ishmael Moletsane.

Before the arrival of Mr. Moletsane, Mr. McLaughlin had paved the way for him. Mr. McLaughlin spoke to both the National President and Regional Chairman and to the Branch Chairperson of the People's Educational Association in Koforidua stating that Mr. Moletsane would like to work closely with the People's Educational Association and that he might hire one of these officers on a part-time basis to work with him on his program with the People's Educational Association. These two officers assured Mr. McLaughlin of their support to whatever meaningful program might be drawn up by the University of Massachusetts Team.

b. Implementing the Program

It was not quite long when Mr. Moletsane arrived in Koforidua from the States. After the usual introductions, Mr. Moletsane held a series of discussions with Mr. Hagan, and Quist of the People's Educational Association, and Mr. Moletsane was introduced to the other officers and members of the People's Educational Association in the Eastern Region.

Mr. Quist commenced work with the team in September, 1976. Plans for choosing village leaders were discussed together by the three members of the Nonformal Education Team and also with the staff of the Institute of Adult Education. Originally ten villages were selected in which the Nonformal Education Team would work, but

this number was later reduced to seven for reasons of accessibility and nearness to Koforidua. The staff of the Institute of Adult Education and some officers of the People's Educational Association helped the director in selecting the seven villages. The villages, all close to Koforidua, were a mixture of People's Educational Association branches and non-People's Educational Association branches.

The collaboration between the Nonformal Education Team and the Institute of Adult Education and the People's Educational Association depended on volunteers who would not have enough time to devote to the Nonformal Education Program which would be run during and after normal working hours. The staff of the Institute of Adult Education were also running their own programs. This then was a problem encountered by the team of the Nonformal Education Program.

c. Collaboration with the IAE

As the Nonformal Education Program progressed it became absolutely necessary that the collaboration should be more with the Regional Executive officers of the People's Educational Association and not the Institute of Adult Education because the Nonformal Education Program was concerned with up-grading the skills of the people in the rural areas, irrespective of their educational backgrounds whereas the program of the Institute of Adult Education catered to literate adults. For example, the Institute of Adult Education does not run literacy classes. These classes are run by the staff ot the Department of Social Welfare and Community Develop-

ment. The Institute of Adult Education is there to assist the People's Educational Association to run such classes but not to do it themselves. Because of such divergencies between the areas of expertise of the University of Massachusetts Team and the Institute of Adult Education it was to develop a better model of collaboration between the two institutions. In fact these two divisions of higher educational institutions, although they both have as their audience the adult population, have divergent strategies for imparting knowledge and skills which are diametrically opposed to each other. For example, the Institute of Adult Education was from the beginning concerned with only extra-mural non-examinable subjects, but later on it prepared students for examinable subjects, i.e., General Certificate of Education, and in addition prepared adults for diploma and degree courses of the University of Legon. It pays the tutors who run a series of ten or more lectures on specific subjects for classes of the People's Educational Association. It also organizes New Year Schools which are attended by both People's Educational Association and non-People's Educational Association members. Subjects for these schools are unilaterally selected by the staff of the Institute of Adult Education without the involvement of the audience for whom these schools are meant.

The University of Massachusetts Team on the other hand has an entirely different approach and does not select or choose subjects or projects for its clientele. It is the clientele who choose their own projects and subjects. The University of Massa-

chusetts Team provided the support and training to upgrade the skills of the clientele. The University of Massachusetts Team works on the job with the members of the People's Educational Association while the staff of the Institute of Adult Education works in a sort of supervisory capacity to oversee the activities of the People's Educational Association. The dichotomy between these two educational institutions did not make for effective collaboration, hence it was rightly stated in the proposal for the collaboration that the People's Educational Association would be the voluntary organization with which the University of Massachusetts Team would collaborate.

d. Collaboration with PEA

In view of the above institutional descriptions, I think that Mr. Moletsane appeared to understand this dichotomy and straight away began collaborating closely with officers and members of the People's Educational Association and strengthened the Center for International Education's role by attending its weekly meetings and actively participating in its programs. Mr. Moletsane became endeared to the People's Educational Association and he always made it plain that he had come to learn and share ideas and not to impose any ideology on Ghanaians. As an African coming immediately after a white American to start projects with rural people in their own settings, the members of the People's Educational Association began to abandon the notion that the University of Massachusetts Team was another CIA outfit. Mr. Moletsane also said he would leave the program for the members of the People's Educational As-

sociation to manage when he was gone. He also spoke of how committed he was to his home government and that there were pressures on him to return home immediately after his education at the University of Massachusetts. He wished, therefore, that many members of the People's Educational Association know all about the Nonformal Education Program. He conferred constantly with the National President of the People's Educational Association who he met at least once a week. He arranged for Mr. Quist of the University of Massachusetts Team to go to the Center for International Education for six weeks for actual program planning and for him to see at first hand what was meant by Nonformal Education.

e. Collaboration with CIE

There were numerous problems among the staff during the middle phase of the program. They can be summarized as follows:

(1) Disagreement over the idea of a co-directorship

(2) Disagreement over team composition

(3) Questions about the legitimacy of decision-making processes within the project

(4) Lack of open discussions of serious issues

(5) Lack of communication with local PEA officials about decisions made by the project.

f. Concerns with Collaboration

These were serious problems and almost led to my resignation. However, the situation improved markedly after organizational development training sessions were instituted by a faculty member (Linda Abrams) from the Center and the arrival of a new staff member (Elvyn Jones-Dube).

The faculty member stayed for a month. During her stay, the two newcomers arranged for staff training sessions where all team members expressed their concerns. They institutionalized certain procedures, i.e., weekly meetings of all team members to discuss all matters concerning the program, a new filing system was instituted and all team members had access to all incoming and outgoing correspondence. A feeling of belongingness amongst team members began to emerge. The People's Educational Association members once again began to play a major part in the running of the Nonformal Education Program. Frequent meetings with the Regional Executive members were held and the Literacy Support Team was formed to handle the literacy sector.

g. Implications for IAE/PEA/CIE

The implications for the Institute of Adult Education/People's Educational Association/Center for International Education that the People's Educational Association has not got the capacity to do things on its own. It has not got a paid staff, no office and no economic power; it could not function efficiently and effectively so it could therefore not execute any long-term planned educational programs. Any programs it draws up were subject to the approval of the Institute of Adult Education or the DVV's Africa Bureau. This latter occasionally sponsored workshops organized for members of the People's Educational Association.

The implications were that the People's Educational Association being in a very weak position could not argue from a position of strength nor could it commit itself to run any worthwhile educa-

tional program like the Nonformal Education Project. It relied on the patronage of the Institute of Adult Education.

As the University of Massachusetts' program will end by 31st December 1977, the People's Educational Association would wish to continue the program with financial assistance from the Institute of Adult Education but we fear the Institute of Adult Education would not be in a position to support the People's Educational Association, and without any outside support the Nonformal Education Project might continue but not effectively and for a long time. This is why the Regional Executive of the People's Educational Association is hoping for additional funding.

h. Continuity of Program

The Regional Executive of the People's Educational Association is pleased with the work of the University of Massachusetts Team and is committed to the Nonformal Education Program and will see to its continuity. The plans and proposals drawn up by both the University of Massachusetts Team and the Regional Executive Members of the People's Educational Association in the Eastern Region are clear testimony of the goodwill that now exists between these two bodies.

The essence of the training the University of Massachusetts Team has so far given to the facilitators, both the People's Educational Association and non-People's Educational Association members, is that they should try to do things systematically and pull their own bootstraps and that the members of the People's Educational Association should seriously think of this in order to re-

structure the People's Educational Association not only to be a vehicle for learning but a truly respectable democratic association of adults. The Nonformal Education Program has indeed been a learning process.

CHAPTER III

VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING OF RURAL FACILITATORS

Linda Abrams
Elvyn Jones-Dube
Ishmael Moletsane
Vidal Quist

CHAPTER III

VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING OF RURAL FACILITATORS

A. Introduction

A major portion of the initial agreement reached between the Institute of Adult Education, the People's Educational Association and the Center for International Education dealt with the development of a Village Facilitator Branch Model--"Branch" here referring to local PEA groups. Through a series of conferences, the PEA had identified a need to refocus:

> The PEA should concern itself with programmes which will improve both local and national talents and skills, not only for the few educated classes, but also the illiterate majority who form the bulk of the working adult population. These activities should . . . raise the living standards of the people. (Point 3, Purpose Committee, 1973)

This refocusing clearly indicated a need and a desire to explore new directions and move away from the pattern of PEA activities that had been academically oriented and had involved lecture and discussion groups for primarily the better educated and English speaking. The project agreement reflected this concern and dealt with the exploration of new models for village PEA branches:

> The goals of the village facilitator branch model will be to develop a process whereby a much wider cross-section of the community participates in the branch activities. Emphasis will shift from a teacher model to a group participation model with villagers taking responsibility for their own actions both in meetings and in development projects. Activities in each village will vary depending on interests and needs. They will likely include a mixture of development projects (water, health, agriculture, etc.) and educational activities (liter-

> acy, numeracy, planning skills, problem solving, etc.). Each village group will constitute a PEA branch and will fall under the same general framework as other branches although the internal structure of the branch may be quite different. (Draft Project Agreement, 1976)

The PEA and UMass were to be partners in the development of the village facilitator branch model; the IAE was to provide formal institutional support for the project. The PEA could provide in-depth knowledge of the local situation, contact and linkages with villages, and a cadre of current PEA members with interest in the goals of the model who could volunteer assistance to the project. UMass could provide personnel for short and long-term assignment in Ghana with expertise in nonformal education program development, training, materials development and evaluation. While both organizations shared overall project goals, for UMass the project represented an opportunity to develop and refine nonformal education techniques as a part of its grant activities, and for the PEA the project could become an important means of expanding and strengthening its own organization.

The rationale, goals and activities of village development were generally delineated early in the project, but the definition of "facilitator" was less explicit. The use of this term changed over the course of the project, depending largely upon the particular visions of those involved. All those participating from UMass had some acquaintance with the facilitator model as it was developed in a previous UMass program in Ecuador and the draft agreement for the Ghana project suggests a model similar to that of Ecuador. However, a uniquely Ghanaian facilitator model did evolve and, later in this report, will be contrasted with that of Ecuador. For the moment, it is sufficient to offer here a definition

of that role that was agreed upon by the PEA/UMass Team in the later stages of the project:

> Facilitator can be any local leader who has an interest in and a commitment to assisting his or her community in improving its economic, educational, health or other condition and in solving related problems.

The village facilitator was to become the crucial link between the PEA as an organization, the UMass input in nonformal education, and village development.

B. Overview of Strategy and Stages in Model Development

As mentioned earlier, the development of a village facilitator branch model was a central part of the original agreement among collaborating parties in the Ghana project. Unfortunately, it was also the portion of the project which suffered most from the unavoidable UMass staff changeovers described elsewhere in this report. Such changes resulted not only in significant activity delays, but also in serious disruptions of long-range plans and, to some degree, a confusion of program goals. As individual staff changed, so did ideas about the purpose and process of model development--it was not until close to the end of the project that individual visions became combined in a PEA/UMass Team understanding of this aspect of the program.

The project agreement outlines the following sequence of events for implementation after the identification of a cluster of potential village project sites:

--Visits of PEA team to individual villages to explain goals, seek support of people, officials, chiefs.

--Interested villages select three to five villagers for facilitator training.

--Two to four-week training session for facilitators in nearby location using specially developed materials.

--Preparation of materials and techniques for use by facilitators in village PEA branches.

--Return of facilitators, formation of branch groups, beginning of activities.

--Village activities continue over three to nine-month period, leading to projects, educational activities, etc.

This sequence might be called Vision 1--that of the drafters of the agreement. It is based largely on the UMass experience in Ecuador and emphasizes local Ghanaian control and participation. In this sequence, facilitators are selected by their own villages and their training involves them in preparing materials for use in their individual villages and in planning for projects specific to their own communities.

During the first six months of the project and the tenure of the first Project Coordinator, Koforidua was identified as the general location of the project, largely because of the high level of PEA activity and support there. However, it was not until September, 1976, and the arrival of the second Project Coordinator, Ishmael Moletsane, that a Ghanaian team member was hired and detailed, concentrated identification and selection of village project sites began. Moletsane and the Ghanaian team member, Vidal Quist, often with PEA volunteers, visited villages in the Koforidua area and ultimately identified ten as potential sites, based on the following general criteria:

1) A village which has a PEA branch.

2) A village that is accessible.

3) A village with an identified strong leadership.

4) A village which may have an active non-PEA group in community development.

5) A village with a rural community that is interested in change leading to advancement.

It was at this point that the actual sequence of activities began to diverge from that outlined in the agreement, largely in response to the experience of Moletsane and Quist in the villages. They found, as other community development workers have consistently found, that villagers are interested first in their own village's needs and problems and that dealing with these is a prerequisite to longer range planning and acceptance of more theoretical aspects of development. The concept of facilitating village development made initial sense only as it could be demonstrated in assisting any one village in solving an actual problem or realizing an immediate goal.

Secondly, Moletsane and Quist recognized that they themselves, as the major communicators for the project with the villagers, needed to establish their own credibility; to demonstrate their own commitment and ability to help. Some necessity for this would have been inevitable in any situation, but the need increased because of a history of unfulfilled promises by other development workers who had been in contact with the villages in the past. Villagers were skeptical; was this one more visit from an official who would talk about self-help, promise outside expertise and support, and never be seen again?

Thus, Moletsane and Quist decided that the most convincing argument for village development PEA groups and facilitator training, was

to act as facilitators themselves with existing groups working on village problems. This also demonstrated their own capabilities and commitment and modeled the facilitator role. Over the next few months they became increasingly directly involved in development projects within the villages that had been selected as potential sites. They met with village leaders and village PEA, church and other voluntary groups, assisting them in identifying village needs and in choosing projects for immediate action. They assisted in planning and in identifying possible resources; they visited government officials in Koforidua to gain support in the forms of official recognition and authorization, sometimes negotiating for technical expertise and physical supplies. It was an extremely time-consuming process, but by the end of 1976 several villages had made substantial progress toward their development goals.

Legitimate questions could and should be raised in regard to this decision to become so actively involved in village development projects. Overall project goals called for village responsibility and control and it is difficult to estimate the degree to which the intervention of Moletsane and Quist influenced village participation and decision making. As skilled facilitators, taking what they believed to be a non-directive approach, it would appear that their presence encouraged grassroots participation, but we do not have data for an assessment of this. Secondly, their role as outsiders, and particularly Moletsane's as a foreigner, assuredly gave them more influence with government officials than that of a village leader. While this was useful over the short run in getting project tasks completed, it could potentially produce a type of dependence on the part of the villagers, seeming to demonstrate that

an outsider, ideally a foreigner, was necessary to obtain the support of their own government agencies.

Such concerns can be partially addressed by examining another aspect of the role of Moletsane and Quist in their village project development work. This was their relationship to and training of village leaders as facilitators. The project agreement had suggested that facilitators be chosen by their villages for training early in the project; after training they would return to their villages to assist in development projects. Instead of this sequence, Moletsane and Quist had chosen to begin with the village development projects. In their work with these projects, they began to identify village leaders, formal and informal, who had potential as facilitators and could benefit from training. Moletsane summarizes leader characteristics:

1) Leading an existing group in the community.
2) Involved in the local problems and attempts to solve them.
3) Showed some interest, commitment and devotion to his role as a leader.
4) Organized meetings working with local people in the projects.
5) Participated in various discussions held with chiefs or any other positional leaders like government officers, etc.

The last two characteristics, in particular, describe behavior that could be observed by Moletsane and Quist during their visits to the villages. The process of choosing leaders for facilitator training became one of self-selection through the leader's interest and willingness to serve his/her community, indirect village selection as indicated through villagers' willingness to follow and support a leader, and the judgment

of Moletsane and Quist, based on their observation and experience with leaders in the villages. The work on village development projects became a strong experiential base for the selection of leaders who would benefit most from further training.

In fact, training began at once, not through formal workshops or structured sessions, but informally, as leaders worked alongside Moletsane and Quist. Village leaders learned from them and from each other in development planning sessions and in organizing and evaluating tasks and resources. Whenever possible, local leaders formed part of the delegation, with Moletsane and Quist, from the village to call upon government officials and seek their support. More experienced and more expert village leaders became, like Moletsane and Quist, informal trainers, while less experienced leaders became, again informally, trainees or apprentices. As the program evolved, this became a conscious strategy and one that would inform the goals and techniques of more structured facilitator training sessions to be offered later.

Moletsane was unable to serve his full term as Project Coordinator for UMass and, thus, could participate only in the first of a series of more formal training sessions for facilitators that he had begun to plan. In this first session, village leaders from seven of the original ten potential villages, those who had been most active in development efforts, met for a weekend workshop to discuss common goals and problems and identify topics for further training. (Content topics as well as techniques for facilitator training will be discussed later in this report.) Moletsane hoped that this would be the first of a series of monthly workshops for facilitators, drawing upon the village project

development experience of the past and aimed at up-grading village leader skills. In a progress report, Moletsane mentions that he hopes these leaders would eventually become trainers of others in their own and surrounding villages. In the same report, he speaks briefly of a plan to involve more PEA volunteers from Koforidua and to prepare them as future trainers.

The actions and plans of Moletsane and Quist for a village facilitator branch model might be called Vision 2--a vision reactive to experience but incompletely formulated at the time at which Moletsane left the project . The sequence of Vision 2 might be summarized:

--PEA/UMass team work with selected villages in the identification and implementation of village development projects.

--PEA/UMass team work with village leaders in projects and, where appropriate, begin informal facilitator/apprenticeship training of leaders.

--Selection of village leaders for facilitator training workshops.

--Simultaneous with continued village development projects, weekend workshops for facilitators conducted.

--Training of facilitators and Koforidua PEA members as facilitator trainers.

The ingredients of Vision 1 and Vision 2 were essentially the same, but the formulas for sequence and combination were significantly different.

Early in 1977, and within the same few weeks, Moletsane left Ghana, Quist began a brief internship at the Center for International Education, UMass, to study nonformal education techniques, and a new Project Administrator, Jan Smith, arrived in Ghana. For the village development facilitator model, this transition came at a critical time; Moletsane's plans for training and further model development were as yet incomplete

and undocumented. The new Project Administrator was without Moletsane's and Quist's experience base in the villages and had a great many demands upon her time and energy that made it difficult, if not impossible, for her to focus on the facilitator model. Quist's input was temporarily lost and, by the time he returned to Ghana, new directions had been established.

The nonformal education project thus far had been composed of three separate focuses of activity: the wayside fitters cooperative, cultural groups and village development projects. A fourth was now added--training of village literacy teachers or facilitators. Each program component was associated with a UMass staff member, Jan Smith taking major responsibility for the literacy training. While each component operated separately, there was considerable overlap across other dimensions. Several villages were the site of two or three activity components and often the same village leaders were involved in two or more types of activities. So, for example, a member of a village cultural group might also become a literacy teacher, or take a leading role in a development project. Time constraints and the understandable predisposition of project staff to concentrate on their own areas of responsibility and interest became barriers to the coordination of these diverse program activities.

When Quist returned to Ghana he resumed responsibility for contact with the village development projects and for follow-up and support of their efforts. Much of the impetus of this program area had been lost due to his absence and Moletsane's leaving, since other project staff had neither the time nor the experience with the village development

projects to take a strong role in revising, expanding and implementing Moletsane's tentative plans. No further facilitator training workshops were held and Quist's visits to villages and assistance to them continued to be the major activity in this program area.

PEA involvement also underwent change during this period. When Moletsane, as Project Coordinator, had made village development a central program concern, PEA leaders from Koforidua had been involved in village visits and assistance, as well as in planning and training. As village development became less central and other program components received greater attention, PEA involvement declined. Some members of the Koforidua PEA became active in the literacy program, but the nature of PEA involvement was less that of an organization supporting program efforts and more that of individuals who happened to be PEA members interested in particular activities.

There was dissatisfaction on the part of some PEA leaders about this situation. Communication and personnel problems increased the difficulties of dealing with the dissatisfaction openly and a "wait and see" attitude was adopted. As often happens in such stalemate situations, an outside catalyst was needed for program review and problem resolution. This occurred with the arrival of two new project staff in July, 1977. One was to work for a month in the areas of training and staff development; the other was to work for six months in the area of program evaluation. In the process of their orientation and in planning sessions with project staff and PEA leaders dealing with the next and final six months of UMass involvement, revisions were made in the distribution of resources to program components and the village develop-

ment activity area was given additional support.

Support for village development projects took several forms. It was agreed that one of the new project staff, Elvyn Jones-Dube, would work with Quist in support of village projects, in addition to her other responsibilities in gathering program assessment data. Plans for a village facilitator training workshop were begun. PEA involvement in this program component increased and PEA and UMass personnel began to draft a proposal for the continuation and expansion of village development efforts under the direct auspices of the PEA.

Another village facilitator workshop was conducted in September, 1977, on the subject of "Accessing Resources for Village Development" and was rated a strong success by all who participated. Both content and techniques built upon the real experience of participants in village development projects over the past year.

A third vision of the village facilitator branch model was evolving, a vision particularly of the PEA, but shared in part by UMass personnel. In this model village development came to mean primarily projects dealing with physical improvements (water lines, new school buildings, etc.) and agro-industrial economic improvements (soap-making, farming cooperatives, etc.). Educacional projects such as literacy or numeracy classes were seen as separate from, although potentially contributing to, development projects. If this model were to be further developed, facilitators would require training and support in small business management, finance and credit, budgeting, etc. Facilitators would become technical advisors to local economic development activities. Thus Vision 3 was a central subject of the PEA's proposal to expand the non-

formal education program.

It should be noted that Vision 3 did not exclude or eliminate other PEA branch models. That is, local PEA groups could be formed around literacy and other classes or around existing cultural groups. PEA members took major responsibility for aspects of the literacy teacher training and both the cultural group union and the wayside fitters cooperative affiliated with the PEA. However, key PEA leaders had been involved in the village development projects from the beginning of the nonformal education program and had come to see such projects as an important opportunity of special significance beyond other program components. These PEA leaders clearly regarded economic development and physical improvements in village life as high priorities and as project areas in which the PEA should contribute resources and expertise.

In summary, the village facilitator branch model outlined in the original agreement had undergone significant changes in the course of the program. The village facilitator was no longer a generalist, trained in basic community development and education skills, who would turn his or her hand to whatever problem or need the community identified. Instead, there had developed three distinct models:

1) A cultural group branch model in which the facilitator was a cultural group leader trained in stagecraft and community problem identification.
2) A literacy group branch model in which the facilitator was a community member trained in literacy instructional methods and in the training of other instructors.

3) A village development branch model in which the facilitator was trained in project development, strategies and management related to physical and economic village improvement.

While all these models will continue to exist in various villages, it is likely that the model with the greatest potential for continued success and expansion is that in which the PEA has had the most involvement and investment.

The remaining subsections of this portion of the report include a summary of village development projects and a more detailed case study adapted from reports by Vidal Quist, a description of the training provided village development facilitators and a brief section of observations and recommendations--Vision 4--Hindsight.

C. Summary of Village Projects and Case Study

Of the ten villages initially identified as potential project sites, including Koforidua, seven implemented village development activities in conjunction, to varying degrees, with the nonformal education program. The basic steps in the development process were similar for all. Moletsane and Quist, with PEA members, visited the villages to explain the nature and purpose of the program and to learn what types of development activities were already planned or in progress. In follow-up visits they met with village leaders and appropriate groups--PEA groups if they existed, church service groups, and other volunteer community groups. The subject of these meetings was the identification and clarification of village development needs.

Simultaneous with project definition was the identification of vil-

lage leaders. At the point at which project plans became concrete, these leaders took responsibility for project tasks, while the PEA/UMass team acted as advisors. When government resources were needed and a delegation was sent to request support from officials, the village leaders became the major spokespersons for their communities and projects.

An important portion of the team's advisory role was that of suggesting methods of increasing community support and participation. Moletsane and Quist worked with village leaders to assist them in creating strategies for community involvement in needs assessment, setting priorities and planning projects. Another area of advice was that of management and organization--some village projects required supplies from multiple sources, complex scheduling and resource allocation. Wherever appropriate, the team offered assistance in this area.

As might be expected, a consistent initial problem in contacting the villages was to overcome the typical image of American-sponsored projects as offering large sums of money and physical resources. Clear descriptions of the advisory role and the limitations of project staff were a critical part of early conversations.

A second consistent problem throughout the program involved transportation and communication between Koforidua and the villages. Village distances from Koforidua varied, but transportation to even the closest was made difficult by poor roads, petrol shortages, the lack of project vehicles and few and expensive public transportation services. Communication with villages had to be in person or by mail, a circumstance often causing unavoidable delays in scheduling meetings

and official visits.

Much project staff time and energy was expended in traveling to and from village project sites. However, this expenditure was recognized as crucial, at first to demonstrate the team's real commitment and support of the projects and later to provide encouragement to local leaders in project implementation. In a sense, all the village projects were "pilot" projects, partially experimental in nature, and their success would demonstrate to the leaders and villagers involved that positive change through their own efforts was a real possibility.

The following summarizes the types of development projects implemented by each village.

Akwadum: This village initially expressed only mild interest in the nonformal education program until April, 1977, when Quist discussed the possibility of literacy classes. A half-day workshop in literacy methods was conducted in the village, followed by another workshop in literacy a month later. This was one of the first opportunities for the PEA/UMass team to introduce literacy classes as a possible PEA branch model. The success of the workshops in Akwadum and the subsequent formation of literacy classes there was an important step in the development of the literacy component of the nonformal education program.

Jumapo: When Moletsane and Quist began discussions with the leaders to Jumapo they learned that two years before they had asked the Koforidua Municipal Council to levy a tax on village adults to be applied to the building of a new Middle School. Little follow-up of this action had been done and when a delegation from the village visited the Council Treasurer they found the results of the tax collection unsatisfactory. They also learned, however, that the Central Government was making money available for schools and immediately submitted an application for funds. Several months of negotiations with the Council and potential contractors ensued. The final result was the building of the Middle School according to a design approved by the village. While the bulk of the construction was done by a contractor through government funding, villagers contributed their labor, and, as previously planned, their taxes were applied to construction costs.

Nankese: Two related development projects were conducted by the village of Nankese--literacy classes and a soap-making industry, related through their participants who were primarily the same group of older women, in need of means to increase their incomes. PEA/UMass involvement in the classes was in the form of training and assistance to the literacy instructor. Class materials were developed that dealt with the vocabulary, process and problems of soap making. In direct regard to the soap-making industry, the PEA/UMass team provided assistance to the group in locating alternative sources of basic ingredients, often in short supply. The team also provided support to the soap makers in obtaining loans or grants from government agencies for purchasing better equipment and ingredients.

Nyerede: Development efforts in this village focused on the reconstruction of the road connecting the village to Koforidua and the roofing of two unfinished classrooms in a primary school. Both projects involved lengthy negotiations with officials of various government agencies and called for patience and persistence on the part of village leaders. Government equipment was assigned to the clearing and leveling of the road and villagers contributed their labor to the task. Roofing for the school was also supplied by another agency. The village organized to provide funds for other materials and carpenter labor. The PEA/UMass role was advisory, lending support in planning and strategy sessions and encouragement in visits to government officials.

Okorase: Perhaps the most complex development project was undertaken by this village--the construction of a water line for treated water from Koforidua, a distance of four miles. The project requires coordinated planning by the village leaders, negotiations with many officials and agencies, and extensive communal labor by the villagers. Problems and setbacks included physical barriers to the waterlines, stolen pipes and disagreements among groups within the village. Again the PEA/UMass role was one of advice, support and encouragement. The successful completion of the project received regional recognition and both officials and villagers of the area pointed to it as a model for future village development efforts. (See more detailed case study that follows.)

Suhyen: While the PEA branch in this village was involved in a variety of activities, including a day care center and literacy classes, the activity of major interest was the strengthening of the village Sugarcane Growers Association. The PEA/UMass team worked with members of the Association to improve its organization and efficiency. Contact was made with the Department of Cooperatives in Koforidua, who supplied technical assistance to the Association in the procedures of forming a cooperative. Such procedures included establishing a means for Association members to buy shares in the cooperative and obtaining additional land for coop farming.

The summaries above give only the briefest outline of village development activities. The case study of the village of Okorase, which follows, written primarily by Vidal Quist, gives a more detailed description of the development process, including the kinds of problems encountered and strategies for resolution.

Case Study--Okorase: Initial discussions between Moletsane and Quist and village leaders of Okorase dealt with community involvement and decision making as a part of village development efforts. This concept at times ran counter to traditional patterns of leadership, in which the chief, elders and other leaders made decisions about the village, involving the community only at points when communal support in labor or donations were necessary. Discussions also dealt with problem analysis and the identification of village development needs, generating ideas for potential projects and concrete examples of the necessity for expanded community participation in development.

One such example was the need for safe drinking water, identified previously by members of the local group of the National Redemption Council. After discussing the costs of materials involved in bringing in treated water from Koforidua, the group had dismissed the idea as impractical. When the idea was raised again in discussions with Moletsane and Quist, the suggestion was made that the entire community donate money to the project. This was rejected because it was felt the poverty of most villagers would not enable them to contribute any funds to the project. Those involved in the discussion began to be discouraged and lose interest, until a second suggestion was made to send a delegation

to the government agency responsible for water supply. A delegation of four was appointed, including two village leaders who would be the principal speakers and Moletsane and Quist who would play a supportive role.

The first visit by the delegation to an official of the Water and Sewage Corporation was not encouraging. They were told that current funds were to be used for repairs, not major new works, and that there were no immediate plans for extending water to Okorase, a distance of four miles. When the delegation reported back to the village, spirits were dampened and some dismissed the idea of any further attempts. However, after considerable discussion, it was agreed that a follow-up visit to the official should be paid by the delegation.

At this second meeting, conversation began on the subject of Koforidua's temporary water shortage and the subject of Okorase's needs for safe water was mentioned gradually and later. A more congenial atmosphere for discussion had been created and the official was more relaxed and more frank in his description of problems. Because of limited funds and supplies, the Water and Sewage Corporation was unable to implement new programs. Allocation of funds for major works, such as the construction of new water lines, was done by the Regional Administration. Given this information, the delegation inquired if the official would welcome its calling on the Regional Commissioner, and the official raised no objection.

The next meeting of the delegation with other village leaders focused on strategies for seeing the Regional Commissioner. One suggestion was made that the delegation should bypass the Regional

Administrative Officer, the Secretary to the Regional Commissioner, and go straight to seek audience with the Regional Commissioner. After much discussion the group decided that first seeing the Regional Administrative Officer might gain them valuable information and would also demonstrate their willingness to follow usual agency procedures. When the delegation did call upon the Regional Administrative Officer, he recommended that they bring their request personally to the Regional Commissioner.

Another strategy session was held before visiting the Regional Commissioner. Roles were clarified and, as in the other visits, it was decided that the village leaders would be the chief spokespersons, with Moletsane and Quist supplementing their presentations when appropriate.

Their presentation to the Regional Commissioner focused on the need for treated water in Okorase in disease prevention and on the village's ability to provide communal labor for work on the water project. The Regional Commissioner listened with sympathy and replied in terms of some encouragement. He asked the delegation to see him in a week's time, during which he would consult with officials of the Water and Sewage Corporation. After leaving his office, the delegation again visited the official of the Water and Sewage Corporation they had seen previously, to enlist his support in discussions with the Regional Commissioner.

A week later, when the delegation again visited the Regional Commissioner, they were told they would get help in bringing treated water to Okorase if they could give assurance that the adult population would get ibvolved and give free communal labor. The Regional Commissioner asked the Water and Sewage Corporation to submit cost estimates on the

project. With this assurance from the Regional Commissioner, the delegation then went up to the Department of Social Welfare and Community Development to borrow hand tools (shovels, spades, pickaxes) for digging trenches for the laying of the water pipes. This Department supplies such equipment free for community work; the tools are returned to the Department after the completion of the work at hand.

A meeting was arranged of the whole township of Okorase and a gong-gong was beaten at the behest of the chief, who has authority over the town crier. The gong-gong beater summoned everyone to a general meeting, to which the PEA/UMass team had been invited. A big shed was erected and the cultural group and singing band rendered songs at the function. The meeting was chaired by the chief and the village leaders gave an account of their meetings with government agencies. The people were happy with the report and some made voluntary contributions to signify their approval of the work done so far by their leaders.

The Regional Commissioner visisted Okorase during the cultural ceremony of "pouring libation"--a tradition which had to precede the process of digging trenches for water pipes. At the next meeting with the Regional Commissioner, the village leaders and program staff reported that the whole community was ready to start digging the trenches. The Regional Commissioner directed that water pipes be delivered to Okorase and when they arrived the townspeople started to dig the trenches. Officials of the Highway Authority had pegged the track for the trenches, assisted by the village leaders and other villagers who had provided wooden pegs.

During the pegging and digging of the trench from Koforidua to

Okorase, the village leaders directed the daily schedule of work for the community. The adult community was divided into seven groups and each group worked one day of the week allotted to it. The headman of each of the seven groups was responsible for his people and made sure his group of men attended communal labor on schedule. The digging of the trench was drudgery, but with occasional words of encouragement from the leaders, the work progressed slowly but steadily.

Progress was interrupted when it was discovered that a rock over a hundred feet wide was buried in the path of the digging. A village meeting held to discuss the problem resulted in a decision to seek the advice of the Water and Sewage Corporation. When a delegation from the village visited the Corporation, they were advised to build a fire around and on the rock and when it was very hot, pour cold water on it to crack it. The delegation was skeptical of this advice and persuaded the Corporation official to examine the rock before any action should be taken. After the examination, the official recommended the use of galvanized pipes, which his Corporation would provide, to be laid across the rock. After this temporary setback, the digging of the trench continued from the other end of the rock to link the water pipe to the line from Koforidua.

During the third month of the digging, the strength of the labor force that first began the work started to dwindle. The village leaders reported this to the Regional Commissioner and he supplied free food items to be shared among the workers as incentive. This gesture not only boosted morale but also brought added energy. Some adults who had never before reported for communal labor came to work in anticipation

of a supply of food items.

Another problem arose when a number of young men in the village lodged a complaint with the leaders to the effect that they saw no reasons why the school teachers in the village were not participating in the communal labor. This genuine protest nearly brought chaos to the village. The leaders called an emergency meeting and asked the teachers to supervise their pupils to carry the water pipes from the village to the trenches once a week. This arrangement mollified the protesting young men.

A third potentially serious setback to the project was the theft of water pipes. Children from Okorase saw two men drive up to the trench, collect eleven pipes and drive away. The children reported the incident to a village leader and together they were able to identify the truck. Within a short time the pipes were retrieved from the place they had been hidden and the men who stole the pipes were arraigned before the court of Koforidua. The efficiency and effectiveness of the way this situation was handled increased the credibility of the leaders and the community as a whole. If the pipes had not been retrieved it would have cast a stigma on the community, particularly the leaders, and brought the project to a halt for some considerable length of time. Not only would the pipes have been difficult or impossible to replace, but it is likely that suspicion would have been thrown on the people of Okorase as responsible for the theft.

The digging of the trench was completed early in August, 1977. It was commissioned a month later by the Regional Commissioner at a very colorful ceremony and a day-long celebration in the village. The

Regional Commissioner pointed out that the communal labor of the people of Okorase had resulted in a twenty-five percent savings in the cost of the project and congratulated them for their exemplary contribution.

The success of this project received wide recognition in the region. Leaders from a neighboring village asked Okorase village leaders to show them how to make representations to the government and access resources. For the people of Okorase, the project demonstrated their potential to take the leadership in their own village development. They have begun to discuss new project possibilities, including a health clinic, bringing electricity to the village and a rural housing plan.

D. Training of Rural Facilitators--In-Service Model

As illustrated in the previous case study and project descriptions, much of the training of rural facilitators was done through the PEA/UMass team working with the village leaders on development projects. This in-service training constituted the bulk of the training provided to rural development facilitators by the nonformal education program. More structured facilitator training workshops offered by the program are described in a subsequent section of this report.

Perhaps the most consistent technique used by the PEA/UMass team in in-service training was that of modeling facilitator behavior. In planning and strategy sessions with village leaders and other village groups and in visits to government officials with village delegations, the team attempted to demonstrate facilitator functions. A partial list of these, drawn from descriptions of the team's role in the development projects, follows.

Establishing a participatory atmosphere and process that is non-threatening to traditional leaders: As previously mentioned, initial discussions with village leaders dealt with the need for group and community support. Efforts were made to involve diverse community groups and to keep the entire community informed of project developments.

Offering techniques of problem analysis and problem solving: As a part of village needs identification efforts, each problem was discussed in depth and multiple approaches and solutions were considered. As in Okorase, this sometimes meant that a need or problem once discarded as unsolvable was reconsidered more systematically and the most feasible approaches were selected.

Creating a self-image of the community as having the right and the ability to seek government resources: Planning, preparation and encouragement were important elements in assisting village leaders to visit government officials and request information and resources.

Emphasizing persistence and planning for setbacks in development efforts: No village development project moved smoothly from start to completion. Leaders became discouraged when their requests for assistance were ignored or shunted from agency to agency. Lack of supplies and bureaucratic confusion often caused delays. The facilitator's role was often that of offering moral support and suggesting methods through or around difficulties.

Providing information on where resources may be available: While no one could be completely effective at mapping the maze of government agencies, the PEA/UMass team could collect and offer information on this subject, information that most villagers, due to time, transportation and communication constraints, would find difficult to obtain on their own.

Decentralizing and distributing project tasks: As projects developed and community involvement increased, it was often the facilitator's role to suggest means of sharing responsibilities and tasks among groups and individuals and to monitor the participatory process.

Recognizing and rewarding individual and group efforts: While ceremonies and celebrations marked project successes, it was equally important to provide recognition for the on-going work of those involved throughout the projects. Both groups and individuals were to be congratulated for each step of progress made and even when their efforts were unsuccessful, recognition of the time and effort expended in the attempt was essential for maintaining commitment and enthusiasm for the projects.

The ultimate goal of the facilitator functions above was to increase the village's confidence and competence in planning and implementing de-

velopment activities. The PEA/UMass team tried to model facilitator behavior and, indirectly, to train village leaders in this facilitator role. The development projects became symbols of success for the leaders and their communities; concrete demonstrations of their own value and competence and a means of increasing their self-confidence in further development efforts.

E. Training of Rural Facilitators--Workshop Model

The first workshop for facilitators sponsored by the nonformal education project took place in Koforidua early in 1977. The major goals of the weekend workshop were to provide an opportunity for village leaders to share ideas and problems about their development projects and to begin planning for future facilitator training sessions. Potential topics identified included community mobilization, identification and use of resources, leadership skills, planning and implementing projects, communication skills, and functional literacy.

It should be noted that, with the exception of functional literacy, all topics suggested relate to the six facilitator functions outlined above. As explained earlier in this report, additional workshops for village development facilitators were not continued. Instead, separate workshops were conducted for those interested in literacy and for cultural group leaders.

Considerable time had elapsed before plans were begun for another workshop for those primarily involved in village development projects. After a review of progress in village projects in July, 1977, the PEA/UMass team decided to contact village leaders to determine their interest

in another training workshop. Several meetings were held with village leaders who were potential workshop participants and ideas and draft designs for a workshop were reviewed. The result of these discussions was a workshop for village development facilitators early in September, 1977, with the theme of "Accessing Resources."

The workshop was intended to provide, in a more structured form than the in-service model, training in the skills, knowledge and attitudes most relevant for facilitators in accessing the resources of governmental and other agencies. In a request to the Institute for Adult Education for funding assistance to the workshop, the PEA/UMass team described the workshop goals:

> To bring together village facilitators and PEA members to share successes and problems, to consider alternative strategies for overcoming difficulties and for project development, to increase their knowledge of possible resources and the means of accessing them, to make specific plans for each village project and for further facilitator training.

Twenty-five village leaders and PEA members from the six villages previously mentioned and Koforidua participated in the workshop, which began on a Friday evening and continued through Sunday afternoon. The training design that had evolved through discussions with facilitators and the PEA/UMass team was a distinctly Ghanaian nonformal education training program. Major training activities and sequence can be summarized:

Friday evening--
* Welcoming addresses, social hour

Saturday morning--
* Facilitator teams from each village meet together to prepare reports on village development activities. Each village team reports to entire group--general discussion of major issues focusing on accessing of resources

* Participants discuss their expectations for the workshop, schedule modified accordingly
* Participants divide into small groups to discuss a critical incident (brief case study) of a typical accessing resources problem. Groups report results of discussion to entire group.

Saturday afternoon--

* Participants receive and discuss a resource list of government agencies and officials who have responsibility for various types of development resources. List prepared by the PEA/UMass team.
* Speech by a governmental official on the importance of planning in accessing resources. Question/answer session. Group photograph.
* Role play on initiative and persistence in visiting government officials followed by discussion of strategies.

Saturday evening--film

Sunday morning--

* Small groups meet to discuss two critical incidents dealing ing with problems of allocating and monitoring resources. Groups report out and discuss major issues.
* Technology Consultancy Center representative presentation on "Accessing Resources for Village Development"
* Workshop evaluation by participants
* Group discussions of when and what should be subject of next workshop

Sunday afternoon--

* Village facilitator team groups draft plan of action for their development efforts, addressing the following questions:
    1. What needs to be done to further village support of the proposed project?
    2. What are the resources needed?
    3. Where are the possible sources?
    4. Who will contact sources?
    5. How will progress and problems be reported and shared with the village? How often will this take place?
    6. What assistance is needed from the PEA/UMass?
    7. By what dates will various aspects of the activity be completed?
    8. Who will present this plan/report to the village?

  Groups report out and discuss plans with entire group.
* Scheduling of follow-up visits and support activities with the PEA/UMass team
* Closing ceremonies.

The design draws upon participant resources and their experience in village development projects and emphasizes their ability to assist and learn from each other. It uses real-life problem situations to generate discussion and conceptualization of alternative approaches and solutions. Ghanaian technical assistance resources are included through speakers and printed information. Role-play provides an opportunity for participants to practice and reflect upon their presentation and persuasive skills. Training begins with a report of current activities and concludes with concrete planning of future potential projects and the next action steps for each village facilitator team are defined by themselves. The entire design is informed by the cultural and social context of rural Ghana.

Participants were enthusiastic in their reactions to this workshop and were quick to offer suggestions for future workshop themes. Members of the Institute of Adult Education and the People's Educational Association who attended the workshop also hoped that similar training sessions could be conducted on related topics. Unfortunately, the UMass involvement in the nonformal education program ended two months later and there was not the opportunity to plan and conduct additional training sessions in that time. If the program is continued under the PEA, it is probable that facilitator workshops of a similar design will be implemented as a part of village development efforts.

F. Vision 4--Hindsight

The evolution of the village development facilitator model in Ghana raises a series of issues related to the selection, training and support

of facilitators that are not unique to this program. Some of these issues deal directly with problems experienced in the program; others are more speculative and deal with possible topics of further exploration. The issues raised here are primarily those perceived by the major author of this section of this report, and, in listing them as questions below, she has also indicated her recommendations.

1. How could a more shared vision of the facilitator role been maintained among the PEA/UMass staff?

This question does not imply that the vision should be static. Rather, it should be a vision that as it changes is shared and understood by the entire program team, not only the one or two staff members who have major responsibility for that program area. There was little staff or team development training provided at the beginning or throughout the program. Such sessions, dealing with major program goals and components as well as team member responsibilities and roles might have offered an opportunity for the entire team to reconceptualize the facilitator role in light of their experience. Documentation of individual team member's ideas about the facilitator model was inadequate in providing background information to new staff members. Finally, village facilitators themselves might have been more involved in defining this role as they gained experience and expertise.

2. Would the problem have benefitted from greater coordination of the individual components?

There is limited data on which to base an answer to this question. It is possible that the separation of components was a natural response to the Ghanaian culture and context as well as to individual team mem-

ber's interests and abilities. However, a more concerted effort to coordinate literacy, cultural group and development activities in one or two villages might have yielded valuable information as to the effectiveness of such a coordinated approach. That there were a few individuals who received training in all of these components and acted as facilitators in each of them in their villages was not so much a result of program planning or coordination, but a product of the individual's motivation to serve his/her community.

3. What were the benefits and limitations in selecting leaders as facilitators?

As described earlier, those selected for in-service and workshop facilitator training were individuals who had demonstrated community leadership in the early months of the program. In most cases they were people of status in the community and held positions of formal or traditional leadership. They began their facilitator roles as recognized authorities in the villages and this increased the likelihood of popular support to the projects. Again, it may be that the pattern of Ghanaian society dictates this choice. Obviously, this implies that the opportunity for those not in such influential positions to become facilitators is restricted. If those not already in leadership positions were to be included it would raise additional questions as to how training might change and how the support of existing leaders could be gained for the projects and the work of the facilitators. Another approach might be to train a team of facilitators in each village. These teams of three or four could include recognized leaders as well as those without influential positions and each team could share skills and offer

mutual support.

4. What additional training might be provided to individual facilitators or village facilitator teams?

The workshop described earlier in this report on "Accessing Resources" is an example of the type of structured training that might be offered facilitators. Each of the six basic facilitator functions previously outlined, or some combination of them, might become the theme of similar workshops. Follow-up visits and informal meetings would be important aspects of continued in-service training and support. If facilitator teams from each village were given this foundation, it would be possible for more specialized training to be provided later to individuals interested in a particular area. For example, one or two individuals from a village facilitator team might receive additional training in functional literacy, other individuals might be trained in some technical aspects of village improvement projects or agro-industry. The team concept would remain, but specialized training could be provided to individuals as the need arose.

It is hoped that if the village development facilitator model is continued by the PEA, some of these issues will be addressed. Further, these issues have implications for nonformal education programs and facilitator training not confined to Ghana, and should be incorporated in research and program development conducted by CIE/UMass in other locations.

CHAPTER IV

CULTURAL GROUPS AS AN EDUCATIONAL VEHICLE

Robert Russell

CHAPTER IV

CULTURAL GROUPS AS AN EDUCATIONAL VEHICLE

As the Center for International Education is institutionally committed to the exploration of new areas of nonformal education, moving into the area of popular culture was a logical next step. In the literature of nonformal education there are a growing number of examples of popular culture being used by developers in their search for new ways to popularize and implement national development goals. There are enough indicators abroad in the field of NFE to allow us to assume rather securely that well-prepared investigations into the applications of popular culture to development projects are a worthwhile and desirable activity.

A. Popular Culture

Let us define popular culture as all the current, live, meaningful, artistic, and spiritual expressions of a contemporary culture as expressed to itself in some communicative medium. Drumming, dancing, singing, puppets, story-telling, acting, television, radio, can all be examples of popular culture media. Any part of the culture that is generally popular with the people and assists them to communicate with each other, is popular culture. The history of its use in development is not a new one. In Indonesia, during the formation of the independence movement to end Dutch colonial rule, itinerant puppeteers carried

the message of liberation and political consciousness to the rural masses with tremendous success.

Today in India, family planning extension agents plan and work in close collaboration with rural dramatists, puppeteers, and dancers to translate the messages of modern family planning into the culture and linguistic vernacular of the target audiences. In Iran, the traditional story-tellers are used extensively as radio program personalities.

When comparing some of these examples of popular culture to the "cultural groups" of Ghana, we are immediately struck by some interesting parallels. The Ghanaian "cultural group" (C.G.) in its myriad of forms and functions, is popular across ethnic boundaries, geographical areas, and linguistic, religious, and social distinctions. Cultural groups involve the youth and the aged, literate and illiterate, even people of Christian, Moslem, and traditional religious persuasions. They originate at a very local and rural level, come into being for complex sociological reasons, and their members participate in them for as many complex personal reasons. The cultural groups that are a part of the current study are usually church or PEA affiliated, have both literate and illiterate members, traditional and Christian religious orientations, and use music, traditional dancing and drumming, choral singing, and drama as their channels of communication.

B. Background

About three years ago, the national secretary of the PEA was informed that choral group in Larteh was interested in becoming a PEA branch. With the encouragement of the Africa Bureau (a German aid organ-

ization known as D.V.V.), Mr. E. Tetteh of Ghana Broadcasting was enlisted as a singing coach, and spent some of his time assisting the group to develop its singing and performing capacity. It did become a PEA branch, and has since been impressing other PEA branches with its particular brand of dynamic enthusiasm. They have also become a rather professionally polished and entertaining group of people to watch. In short it seemed to be a successful branch activity for some of the people who are attracted to the PEA. This kind of local group is usually referred to as a cultural group in Ghana. The Larteh group was a typical, locally organized and locally led group of townspeople and students whose activities met their own personal needs and the needs of their fellow townspeople.

In May of 1976, Mr. K.A. Oduro of the Institute of Adult Education and Mr. Tetteh visited the CIE at UMass. After becoming aware of the leader's experience in using social drama and cultural experiences for educational purposes, they encouraged the Center to investigate further the support of cultural groups within the PEA as a serious and valuable branch activity. With this encouragement, and through subsequent correspondence, the UMass team members in Ghana approached the Larteh PEA branch and discussed with them the possibility of having a UMass team member attached to them. At the time the exact nature of the involvement was necessarily a bit vague, but the Larteh Cultural Group, and the PEA national and regional officers felt the offer for assistance was worth following up.

The overall purpose of the Umass involvement with the PEA and Institute is outlined elsewhere in this document. It will be useful how-

ever to explain some of the expectations that were operating with UMass Cultural Group work. Our involvement with the cultural groups was one way in which UMass attempted to develop a potentially successful, PEA branch model, a stated goal in our original working agreement with the IAE. We were trying to generate a body of experience and information about the characteristics, limitations and potential resources that can be associated with cultural groups. At the same time we were investigating the need and capacity for local institutionalized support for cultural groups. In a larger perspective, we also wanted to develop an experience with cultural groups that could be applied to the national non-formal educational needs of Ghana.

In the available development literature that deals with uses of popular culture, great expectations are raised about its potential; but it is often presented as a basically untested development strategy. Many documents are available spelling out the theoretical advantages of using popular culture in development projects that have special emphasis on communications components. However, these raised expectations are supported by rather few documents that would assist the developer in generating useful guidelines for the practical applications of popular culture to development projects. The UMass team felt a need to generate, in a small specific situation, enough experience and information about possible new techniques that a useful and appropriate set of guidelines and recommendations might be developed. The guidelines would then be made available to other developers in other parts of the world as they formulated their own project designs for their geographical and cultural situations.

C. The Project

The PEA had expressed a need to develop a number of branch models that could be recommended to new PEA leaders as they searched for exciting and useful village level educational activities. With few tried, tested or successful examples of branch activities, many PEA branches were ready for ideas and practical guidelines for administering and managing those activities that were undertaken.

Soon after the UMass "cultural group" team members' arrival, a three-day workshop was instituted in Larteh. The cultural group leaders from all the Eastern Regional PEA Cultural Groups were invited. The workshop assisted the branch leaders to clarify and articulate their needs and problems as PEA branch leaders. This workshop emerged as a key factor in the UMass team's developing a project design that would meet the expressed needs of the PEA national leaders, the UMass NFE team, and the local leaders of the individual cultural groups. The project had to allow the team member to function within a number of roles: first as a technical advisor to a number of cultural groups, providing them with skill development training while learning about their institutional characteristics; then as an educator trying to relate these findings to other national development institutions (the IAE and the PEA) in a way useful to those institutions; and then as a technician in NFE communication strategies, making inferences and conclusions about uses of popular culture in a global perspective.

D. Assumptions

We will at this point briefly list the major assumptions that the

UMass team was working under as they thought through the development of a project design. First, we assumed that the great cost of putting a highly trained and skilled researcher in such a limited geographical area, with exposure to so few people was cost effective when seen in terms of the end products adding significantly to the body of information available to NFE workers.

Another assumption relating to our project, stated that the cultural groups, in their Ghanaian milieu, constituted an appropriate laboratory for our investigations into popular culture. A third assumption involved the level of intervention that we were to work with. As one of the tasks of NFE is to find techniques useful in achieving education goals that are cheaper than those currently available in the formal system, we anticipated that any development or change that the cultural groups adopted should be generated through their existing financial and skill inventory. We were going to use as inputs neither money nor highly technical skills training. We also assumed that the cultural groups desired in some way to become more involved with the development goals and activities of their communities. This assumption was quite a risk as our involvement with them would be less interesting if C/G's really didn't want to associate with national or local development objectives and needs.

We also assumed that the channel through which involvement with community problems and issues would be most practical would be the medium that the groups handled best: singing, dancing and drama. The project was going to explore the dynamics involved in inserting educational goals and information into the cultural groups' traditional format. We also

nneded to know that if the cultural group format could indeed incorporate educational goals, what would be the consequences for the members, the leaders and the communities of that change.

E. Needs Assessment

At the initial three-day planning workshop mentioned earlier, a number of observations and recommendations were produced by the participants. First, the leaders of the C/G's affirmed that they felt a need to understand how their groups might become involved with development projects at a local level. At first glance this might well have been a gesture on the part of the participants for the UMass team. It was what we wanted to hear. However, during workshop discussion groups the cultural group leaders' frustrations in soliciting community support for their activities became clear. It was an obvious and sound strategy, that if the group were to gain a reputation for rendering positive and meaningful service to the local community, more parents and elders would step forward to support general participation in cultural group activities. During another discussion session, a long list of recommendations was generated based on other problems that cultural group leaders encountered in the day-to-day administration of their groups. The discussion groups catalogued the most common complaints of members and leaders, and then brainstormed solutions. This constituted a body of information that needed dissemination to the entire C/G membership and practical implementation if it were to be useful. During the latter part of the workshop it became clear that the C/G leaders shared many common problems with each other. Although the workshop created an

opportunity for the leaders to discuss these problems as peers and created a positive atmosphere of camaraderie, an awareness emerged that these problems would be encountered again and again by other cultural group leaders elsewhere in the country. Also, many of these problems were beyond the scope of one group or one person to deal with effectively (transportation, regional publicity, need for higher institutional support and others). The UMass team member suggested the organization of a regional support union for cultural groups. The suggestion was enthusiastically greeted, but never discussed in detail.

During the third and fourth month into the development of our involvement with the PEA, the IAE and the cultural groups, the various lists of inputs, pressures, needs and agenda began to solidify. UMass needed to know more about the potential of cultural groups in development situations; the PEA needed some examples of successful branch models; local C/G leaders needed support for community involvement. The IAE had regional staff who were trying to support nonformal education, PEA branch activities, and their own formal courses.

In order to meet the project design demands for effective programming that would produce research material, documentation, and at the same time generate useful development and training activities for the PEA branches, a two-front approach was undertaken.

1. One-Day Schools

The programmatic response to all these interests, needs, and basic assumptions was written during joint planning sessions attended by some Institute staff, the UMass staff, regional leaders of the PEA and the

local leaders of PEA branch cultural groups. When thinking through a project design we all tried to be as considerate as possible to each other's particular needs as expressed in the three-day workshop in December.

The result was the development of a series of one-day schools along with other things that would meet the needs of the cultural groups for training in community development applications and internal management development. All the groups involved in the cultural group development felt that all our research and training agenda could be carried out through the format of the one-day school. The planners felt that regular training sessions lasting any longer than a single day would infringe on the daily work needs and habits of the cultural group members.

The schools had three components. A needs assessment and problem identification session in the morning, a rehearsal and problem solving session in the afternoon, and a subsequent performance for the entire community of the results of the workshop.

During the first session the village elders, important social leaders in the town, local extension agents (when available), and the entire cultural group would participate together in a workshop process that identified a wide range of important village problems. In small groups they would rank these problems for their importance and then rank them again for their solvability vis-a-vis the resources available in the town's economic and political hinterland.

The presence of the village leaders and elders lent an air of authority and sanction to the workshop. They also proved to be vitally important for a correct understanding of the facts and history behind a

particular problem, and after the workshop, became key figures in the eventual solution of an identified problem. Their inclusion in the entire workshop process assured the cultural group of the village elders' vested interest in the resolution of the problem.

During the second component, the entire cultural group, with one or two of the elders advising would create, using improvisational theater techniques, a number of dramatic skits or short plays. One skit would pose the problem selected in the first session, and at least one skit would then present a possible solution to that problem. During this second session an elder and the workshop leaders would review the solutions presented in the improvisations, and suggest when necessary, more entertaining and original ways to present the background, the philosophical implications, the techniques' bottlenecks, and the importance of the problem selected. The second session became a learning experience for all the members of the cultural groups as the elder explained what had or had not been learned or tried so far by the chief and other village leaders in their own separate quests for solutions to the problem. During the improvisations where skits took shape, the workshop leaders made sure that each skit was built upon the preceding one. This provided for a series of communication messages that made sense, related constructively with one another, and were all directed towards the same communications goal and audience. The resulting dramas were:

a. About a local problem idenitified by villagers who were themselves affected by the problem;

b. Produced in the local language and within the cultural milieu of the people experiencing the problem;

c. Created with sensitivity to the local resources available for the solution of the problem;

d. Complete with plans for action that identified persons or institutions responsible for long-range action taking.

The workshop leaders always made sure that each drama covered three questions. First, does the drama clearly state a problem and explain why it is a problem; secondly, is the solution presented in the drama a realistic and practical solution; and thirdly, are the people and institutions responsible for taking action clearly identified and is their role clearly spelled out? In relation to support of the third point, characters developed for the skits often had some loose connections with identifiable personalities in the village. During the rehearsals and the performance, the cultural group leaders would try to meet with the people identified as having responsibility for the solutions of the problems, and would request that they make a commitment to participate in the solution to the problem. It would have been unfair to identify institutions or individuals as having subsequent responsibility if those people wouldn't or couldn't agree.

After the rehearsal session was over, the "gong-gong" would be beaten by the town crier who would inform all villagers that they were invited to the chief's palace (or other appropriate place) for an evening's entertainment and fun.

The one-day schools became training grounds for cultural group leaders from other villages. Whenever we traveled to a town to conduct a one-day school, other cultural group leaders were always invited as guest leaders. They played a key role in conducting the workshop, and

were constantly being encouraged to assume more and more control of and responsibility for the workshops. From time to time, the leaders would gather for leadership seminars where we would analyze the one-day school, the cultural groups' development and the overall effect that we were having on the villages. (See Robert Russell, "A Memo to Developers" (Amherst: Center for International Education, 1978).)

In the experience of the UMass Team, anywhere from 300 to 600 people (about sixty percent youths and children) would turn out for the performance. The skits were punctuated with drumming and dancing, and perhaps a few songs from the singing section of the cultural group. Actually, from the total skill inventory of the average cultural group, the drama section would be only one of the attractions offered to the public during an evening's entertainment.

The overall effect of the evening was to communicate the same message to a wide spectrum of the town's population, using the most local mass communications media possible. We also observed the immediate generation of a strong enthusiasm and motivation for dealing with the problem on the part of the townspeople.

The situation in the village at the end of the performance evening was often one the extension workers often take months to develop. A broad spectrum of the population received exactly the same information. They all participated in the idea of a very specific solution to a problem. The cultural group is an already organized body of people, used to working as a team, having their own internally elected leadership, well-informed about the problem (remember that they consulted with the elders and village leaders about the problem and then generated the possible

solution themselves), and they were all motivated and excited about the prospects of having the problem solved: indeed they had chosen the problem themselves.

The UMass team has observed that this "after performance" situation could and should be utilized by a wide variety of extension workers.

2. The Eastern Region Cultural Group Union

Separate from the one-day school, the UMass team member with the assistance and support of the IAE Senior Organizer, facilitated the creation of a cultural group union (CGU) for PEA Cultural Groups within the Eastern Region.

There were a number of factors that influenced the development of that Union.

1. Its creation was an expressed need on the part of the cultural group leaders as voiced at the December, 1976 workshop.
2. In the original working document between the IAE and UMass, the commitment is made to assist the PEA in developing effective branch models that other branch leaders and organizers might learn from. A CGU would be an important step in providing a capacity for disseminating information and expertise about cultural groups to interested branch leaders.
3. It was felt that one way to support the Cultural Group leaders in continuing to involve their groups in community development would be to institutionalize that support in the CGU.
4. It was felt that the existing infrastructure of the IAE and

the PEA would not be able to give enough of the fairly technical and specialized assistance that would constitute a useful level of support for the Cultural Groups, subsequent to the UMass involvement.

5. Other ministries and their extension workers would be better able to respond to a union of cultural groups than to relate to them on a case-by-case basis as cultural groups expressed needs for technical assistance.

F. Important Functions of the CGU

At the December workshop it was decided that a working committee would be set up to take responsibility for all follow-up concerning the recommendations and suggestions that had been drafted. When this committee met and developed the formula for the one-day schools it also appointed a small ad hoc committee to draft a constitution for the CGU. There emerged two primary services that the officers of such a union would provide to member groups. First there was a need for a regional approach to booking performances for the individual cultural groups. Inactivity kills the enthusiasm and commitment of cultural group members faster than almost any other common failure in the cultural group dynamic. This includes poor leadership, ineffective organization, and absence of any outside institutional support. The CGU officers would be responsible for spending part of their spare time in acting as booking agents for member groups soliciting engagements for them; engagements that would keep them busy, and generate a small amount of revenue both for the member groups, and the CGU.

The second responsibility was much more complicated. As all of the CGU leaders would have been eventually trained and experienced in running the one-day schools, they would be able to offer that expertise to member and non-member cultural groups. It was hoped that the Institute and PEA would recognize the potential that exists in these trained leaders, and support their service as dynamic and experienced advisors on the continued institution of cultural groups as PEA branch activities. They would also be responsible for coordinating wherever practical the involvement of local ministry extension workers with the solution of problems identified by the individual cultural groups with their village leaders.

At the end of the project a constitution had been sent out to all interested cultural groups in the Eastern Region, officers had been elected, and the constitution provisionally adopted. The Cultural Group Union will have one of its officers sit on the Regional Executive Committee of the PEA, and will be answerable to that body.

G. What We Learned

1. The Nature of Cultural Groups

Cultural groups must be looked at ultimately as organizations of volunteers. People participate because they get a sense of satisfaction or reward: their leaders tend to be highly charismatic, extroverted people, who enjoy extending themselves and their groups out into the community. Both members and leaders (but especially leaders) often see the cultural group as an avenue through which they can seek greater public recognition. In their enthusiasm many of the leaders or members

write songs, plays or create dances or even new pieces of music; there is always the hope, and indeed the possibility, that a group or individual will be "discovered" and go on to a professional career in the performing arts. Music and drama are seen by many as a way out of the parochial village system and into the greater and more rewarding social system of the urban city.

The Cultural Group is also a social event, where factions, cliques, leadership struggles, egos, love affairs, and friendships all undergo changes and adjust to constantly shifting societal pressures. For many young people the cultural group is a primary and legitimate outlet for their non-worktime socializing. Many more important things are taking place than the singing of songs, the learning of dramas, and the dancing of dances; young people are using the group as a vehicle through which they will shape their lives and reinforce alliances that become important to their survival.

Beyond all these characteristics and observations, we found that we had kept in mind a most pervasive consideration. People join and participate because it is creative and fun. It is stimulating and exciting to participate in the creation of a thing of beauty and a thing of honesty. In a world of questionable motives and behaviors, this opportunity becomes highly honored and almost sacred. For the members it is a joy to work hard with genuine friends to create a song, a dance, or a drama that will bring a small sense of harmony and understanding to their community.

As we began the project we didn't realize the depth to which these highly personal concerns and motivations operated on the behavior of the

members and their leaders.

It was made clear by the leaders of the cultural groups during the first few months of the project that public opinion towards and support for a cultural group dictated to a great degree the success or failure of a cultural group. Many parents were suspicious of their children's (especially the younger women's) involvement with the groups. There is a certain amount of social prejudice operating against participation in an organization where young people are gathering during evening hours, and occasionally traveling to towns far afield. Parents feel that they cannot be responsible for their children's behavior at those times; and that unscrupulous people might well have opportunities to take advantage of their young people in these situations. The net result was a condition where many responsible townspeople wouldn't support the activities of a cultural group. The leaders felt this condition acutely, and generally agreed that if their groups could enjoy a better public relations image, they would have a much greater chance of becoming widely known and more effective as a performing group, one of their criteria of success.

The suggestion to involve the cultural group in community development projects seemed to benefit everyone. The communities would benefit from the added enthusiasm and motivation that the members would bring to bear on local problems and issues; the cultural groups would naturally begin to enjoy a more positive public image. The spectre of the cultural group becoming more involved in community events and problems probably appealed to the leaders on a number of other levels too. It was the proper and right thing to do, and it would give the leaders

entry into the political and power structure of the village in an appropriate and acceptable way.

2. Adding Educational Content to the Cultural Group Format

As was mentioned earlier, the one-day schools focused the attention of the town and the members of the cultural group on a specific local problem. Through the improvisation section of the workshop, the group generated a great deal of information about the technical and social constraints involved in solving that particular problem. The improvised plays engendered a great amount of enthusiasm and motivation in the townspeople to see something done about the particular problem, and everything the workshop did seemed to add up to a great potential for action-taking on an important and significant scale in the town.

Of the four groups that participated actively in our program, three groups actually undertook projects. One cultural group under the very enthusiastic direction of their leader created a day care center and a bakery for the village. Though shortlived due to a lack of line ministry support for day care instructors and funds for meals, it demonstrated a significant change in the attitudes and behavior of the cultural group members. Another cultural group's performance so enthused the local chief that he called for an unprecedented meeting between the two religious faction in the community to discuss an action plan for the creation of a health center for the village. Local ministry officials were invited to address the population on and explain how they should go about dealing with the local bureaucracy to generate support and resources for the undertaking. In this case institutionalized follow-up was again the

weak link in the development process, but the same point had been reinforced: village leaders demonstrated both action-taking behavior and new attitudes towards changes as a result of the C/G activities. The third cultural group set up a committee of local development extension workers who would meet with their group periodically to assist them in determining local development priorities. Suggesting that the extension agents, cultural group members and other interested citizens form into a committee of peers to discuss priorities was a novel and important step. Line ministries in Ghana usually operate under a code of autonomy that is difficult to break.

Adding new locally relevant educational content to the C/G format opened a range of problems that eventually began to affect the solidity of the cultural group. Previous to this project all of their dramas had been written by professional authors. These dramas were for the most part written for English-speaking audiences, by expatriate authors, about situations where there was no relationship between the audience and the actors. The locally improvised dramas on the other hand seemed to leave almost everyone (local leaders, townspeople, group members, local development workers) with a strong obligation to do something. As the dramas fixed attention on those problems that local people could have some control over, much more pressure was created by the drama on all the players and audience to participate in the suggested solution. Suddenly the cultural groups were playing with a much more powerful and potentially disruptive animal than they had ever played with before. They were not dramas that you could simply walk away from, and feel no obligation to take action.

Many of the group members also commented that playing roles which were so much more locally identifiable, or roles that demonstrated negative behavior or characteristics, had a great effect on their daily life. Many of their old friends began to see them in entirely new perspectives. Their relationships within their town often underwent drastic changes. Whether the change was for the better or worse none could generalize. If an actor played a series of villains, then that image tended to stick. Small children would suddenly be more cautious of the person. If the actor played a highly idealistic or moralistic role (a hero or heroine), then the person's public image changed accordingly. In all cases, the public notoriety changed the actor's image in the village. In some cases, this change was unexpected, and difficult. In some it enhanced the actor's authority and leadership capacity. In all cases, it was a change, with much of the attending anxiety and confusion that is associated with change.

An incident toward the end of the project helped us reevaluate many of our initial assumptions about the potential of cultural groups to be important resources in development, and provided us with an insight that brought all the "blue sky" excitement into a more useful and helpful focus.

The cultural group leader in one village had been trying to bring together two local cultural groups for a single workshop. The second group and its leaders were enthusiastic about the possibilities of merging with the first group, and we were all looking forward to the first one-day school that would involve two different groups at the same time. On the day of the workshop, members from the second group showed up, but

hardly anyone from the original group, whose leader was in fact organizing and advocating the workshop, responded.

Upon subsequent discussion and analysis with these leaders and other experienced cultural group leaders, we concluded that as leaders and trainers, we were giving too much emphasis to our goal of "changing" the cultural groups to get them more involved in education and community action projects. The first group had become jealous. Their leader seemed to pay more attention to the second, "outsider" group. They were in fear of losing his leadership and attention, and would have nothing to do with aiding and abetting this trend by participating in a workshop that would erode their identity. It could be said that this leader hadn't consulted properly with his group, but we did observe that similar subtle changes had been occurring in the other groups as well. People were beginning to get bored.

A Cultural Group is not originally formed to be a community development "action unit." To assign a group the responsibility of solving the problem identified by a skit was both unfair, and inappropriate. On the other hand, the cultural group members are all residents of the same town and victims of the same problems as any other people. The groups repeatedly signified that they were ready to provide support and energy to the solution of the identified problem but we had to conclude that assigning the Cultural Group with the primary responsibility was beyond the collective interests or commitments of the members.

Cultural group members are not development workers. They do not always have the training, expertise, commitment or time necessary to actually solve any one major problem. The leaders noted this and even-

tually began bringing into the rehearsal phase of the workshop extension workers whose job descriptions paralleled the kinds of technical and professional support that would be required for any solutions to take place.

In all fairness it should be made equally clear that where the Cultural Groups' organizational capacity was well developed, local leaders and extension workers supported them actively. Their willingness to undertake substantial responsibility for the problems rose proportionally with their actual capacity to solve those problems. It might be well to distinguish here between adding an educational component to the Cultural Groups' format and adding an action component. Many leaders observed that developing a capacity to improvise dramas allowed their groups to bring much more locally important information and education to their regular evening presentations. The improvisations became important learning experiences for the audience, but much more so for the actors and actresses. The learning experience was fun and immediately useful, and remained an important strength in the argument for improvisational drama. But as we mentioned earlier, depending on the group to take an unusual amount of responsibility for the action component usually resulted in some of the cultural group members becoming disillusioned and bored with the group's activities.

3. Training

The investigation of cultural groups as community development resources was an inquiry into the potential and ability of a traditional institution to change its behavior and focus. What training we did was

defined by this understanding, and was not intended to bring to bear any sophisticated, or highly technical techniques or content. We wanted to see what a cultural group could do with what talents they already had. Training leaders in modern community development approaches through technically advanced training designs could tend to inhibit an understanding of how simple it is to redirect their energy to development issues. The training that took place during the one-day schools consisted of two elements. First, the UMass trainer demonstrated the theatrical improvisation techniques that would enable a cultural group to generate short skits and dramas about important village issues. The second element was an attempt to bring the cultural group leaders into a closer working and social relationship with each other. As they all encounter at one time or another very similar leadership problems and frustrations, we felt that their having a closer relationship with each other would encourage a sharing of their strategies and experiences. If nothing more, it would give them a psychological boost and reinforce their resolve to continue to provide enthusiastic leadership for their groups.

With the exception of two leadership seminars for the cultural group leaders, all formal and structured training was through the one-day school. The workshop was so simple that there was never a question of bringing into the situation substantially new information about development approaches. As we began to involve local extension workers from the line ministries in the workshops, we found that these extension agents could provide the technical information and institutional support necessary to carry out the plans of action that the cultural

groups proposed.

When looking for patterns in the training dynamic, we identified three formats for intervention that we had used with the cultural group. First there was an individual "one-to-one" where the UMass team member worked closely and in an advising capacity with the individual cultural group leaders. This took place during the pre-one-day school planning sessions that the author had with each of the cultural group leaders, and characterized much of the day-to-day interaction that he had with them. Then, there was the one-day school, where he worked with leaders and their cultural group; and lastly, there were a few situations where the team member worked with groups of leaders only. This latter situation obtained to the greatest extent while the cultural groups' leaders were forming the Cultural Group Union. These working sessions involved virtually all of the leaders of the four participating groups, and a representative of the PEA regional committee. During these sessions discussions were held about the role of the leaders as Union Officers. One of the more important topics was the motivational dynamics for keeping the booking officers (those designated to carry out the mandate of the Union to solicit bookings for member groups) active. A more difficult problem that we tried to deal with during these sessions was that of officers providing training services (consisting of running one-day schools for new groups joining the Cultural Group Union) for other Cultural Groups. Although the leaders had attended, participated in, and helped organize a number of one-day schools, they hadn't actually run a school from start to finish without the support of the UMass team member. They had mastered very well the mechanics of the workshop, but lacked the

confidence to shoulder the ultimate responsibility.

H. Summary

In retrospect, we might have done a greater service to the cultural groups within the limited time that we had available if we had focused more of our attention towards leaders and their groups, and less on leaders and their roles as members of the Cultural Group Union. While acting as members of the Union they were moving towards a capacity to deal with some of the community development problems identified by their individual groups. What the leaders eventually had to deal with was the changing dynamics that were precipitated by involving the group in community development activities. By adding a community development focus to the activities of the groups, they were changing their total dynamic faster than the leaders could keep up. Because of the limited time our project had, we were not able to provide the leaders with the sensitivities and skills that would have helped them to cope with the greater demands that group members felt asked of them. Members had joined to have fun and be creative, not to get so involved with difficult field trips to the regional ministries to meet with intimidating "big people," or to give up a precious Saturday afternoon to clear land for a village project. We originally knew that cultural groups would survive without any extra-village institutional support. But a group could never survive if its members didn't have good relationships with its leadership. A wiser strategy might have been to weigh our intervention towards work with leaders in their village situations with their groups--more experiences like the one-day

school--but with less pressure on getting the group to "do" something about the problems that they helped define. The corollary would have been to spend less time developing within leaders a regional identity through their association with the Cultural Group Union. But there was still another factor at work. While the groups were quietly suffering because of their leaders' change in attention (from their attention to the group to their attention to the Regional Union) their leaders were beginning to see new horizons. Their consciousness towards the power that their communications skills had was deepening. Many of them were expressing awe at the ability of their groups to affect public opinion and change attitudes. Some had never seen their fellow villagers get as excited over a project or idea as they did after the evening performances. In ways that were important and unavoidable, the leaders were expanding their visions and their sense of personal ability faster than their fellow cultural group members were.

It must remain the prerogative of each person we work with to make his or her own decisions about their career direction in life. If a leader decides that he or she is ready to move out and away from the cultural group, that too is the development of human resources in the community development context. Like many voluntary organizations (particularly those that attract youth), a cultural group is often a stepping stone in the individual's growth and development; a phase that one goes through in the maturing process. Perhaps it would suffice to say that each leader exhibited differing abilities and a differing willingness to continually develop and challenge their own group to enable them to face the problems that were thrust upon them as they engaged in com-

munity development activities. What the UMass team might do in the future in this kind of a situation would be to cater more to the needs of the cultural group as a unit, and put less stress on the development of their leaders as members of a leaders' group (the CGU).

We did learn that without a question, the format of the local cultural group was receptive to change; that the format was flexible enough to include both an educational component, and where appropriate, an action component. That dealing with community problems through drama, music and song was tremendously effective as a communications strategy. We observed that the kinds of leaders that tended to rise within the cultural group were charismatic and usually quite articulate; people who already had exhibited effective leadership styles within their own milieu.

It was also interesting to look at the results of our attempt to institutionalize the cultural group leadership into the Cultural Group Union. From the points of view of all the major institutions involved, it was probably a good idea. It was more convenient to deal with the individual groups if they were organized into a Union. But the individual groups really could see little advantage in it. Ultimately the level of commitment and technical expertise that the CGU leaders would have to render in order to provide individual groups with useful services would have to be rather high, probably higher than was reasonable to expect without substantial financial and training support. Institutionalization of the cultural group leaders had implications beyond those that we were able to anticipate; that single action, more than the addition of an action or educational component to the traditional

format, caused motivational and social stress in the fabric of the cultural group.

At the time of this writing, some of the cultural group leaders who have worked with the UMass project anticipate participating in an expanded project to even further explore the applications of popular culture to the development needs of Ghana. We hope that frustration and failures, as well as the successes and small victories that we have experienced in this project will become the basis of a second generation of activities in development with cultural groups.

CHAPTER V

ASSISTANCE IN ADULT LITERACY

Janice Smith
J.K. Hanson
Fanny Dontoh

CHAPTER V

ASSISTANCE IN ADULT LITERACY

A. Rationale and Objectives

When the Center for International Education proposed to work collaboratively with the PEA and its parent institution, the IAE, it was to use NFE as a tool to help the PEA meet goals, which it had set for itself. The following are among the recommendations of several committees appointed during the 1973 PEA Consultative Conference:

> --. . . PEA should concern itself with programmes which will improve both local and national talents and skills, not only for the few educated classes, but also the illiterate majority who form the bulk of the working adult population. These activities should . . . raise the living standards of the people. (Point 3, Purpose Committee)
>
> --. . . the development of appropriate teaching methods using local materials as much as possible . . . there is a dire need for the Institute to relate its teaching to the local environment to enable students to relate their knowledge to local problems. (Point 3, IAE/PEA Relations Committee)
>
> --If the group of adults which forms the bulk of the people is to be considered eligible for membership in the organization, then activities organized in the local languages will have to be instituted. (Membership Committee recommendations)

One of the approaches proposed by the Center to help the PEA meet these goals was based on an earlier NFE project carried out by CIE in Ecuador. The proposal was for the development of the Village Facilitator PEA Branch Model. After an appropriate group of villages had been selected, the following steps were expected to take place:

--Visits of PEA team to individual villages to explain goals, seek support of people, officials, chiefs.

--Interested villages select three to five villagers for facilitator training.

--Two to four-week training session for facilitators in nearby location using specially developed materials.

--Preparation of materials and techniques for use by facilitators in village PEA branches.

--Return of facilitators, formation of branch groups, beginning of activities.

--Village activities continue over three to nine-month period, leading to projects, educational activities, and so forth.

--Monitoring and periodic evaluation and writing of case study by PEA/UMass joint team.

The goals of the village facilitator branch model were to develop a process whereby a much wider cross-section of the community would participate.

CIE also stated its intention to respond at a local level to interests and needs articulated by local leaders, PEA and others, for educational activities they felt were needed and could be supported in their villages.

As articulated in the statement of assumptions (pp. 40-43, of this report), it was felt (1) that the program should be developed around the talent and special interests of staff; (2) that their skills in NFE would prove useful to organizations and individuals working in rural areas; (3) that a collaborative program should use staff both from the Center and from the cooperating institutions, and, by extension, of the villagers in the villages themselves; (4) that cooperating groups should jointly define program objectives; and (5) that all groups would gain something

from the collaboration.

All parties in the collaboration expressed interest in literacy as a part of the NFE program in one way or another. The Director of the IAE had encouraged the PEA through speeches to become involved in literacy, and the National Secretary on loan to the PEA from the IAE had also spoken repeatedly of the importance of educated PEA members serving their communities by volunteering to start literacy classes.

The PEA responded at its annual conferences by passing resolutions that it should, by all means, be involved in the nation's efforts to eradicate illiteracy. In March of 1977, the theme for PEA week was declared to be "Help a brother or sister learn how to read and write."

At the local level, one of the seven communities chosen to participate in the NFE program already had a PEA literacy class, which had been functioning for close to a year. And another community expressed the desire to begin literacy classes.

The Center had developed a literacy method in Ecuador, which responded to the perceived learning needs of the community, and the goal of which was community consciousness-raising and dialogue. The method was supported and supplemented by the use of locally developed or adapted skill-practice games and simulation games. Literacy had served as the core of community NFE in Ecuador and constituted a major part of facilitator training. So there was the expectation on the part of the Center that this method might well be adapted and tested in the Ghanaian context.

B. Activities, Problems, and Accomplishments

1. Activities

Both the IAE and NFE project staff attempted in a variety of ways to assist the PEA to establish and carry on literacy classes. The staff of the IAE in the Eastern Region planned and carried out one-day schools and weekend workshops with literacy as the theme. NFE program staff and staff of the Department of Social Welfare and Community Development were invited to participate.

The workshops included discussion of the importance of literacy training conducted by IAE staff; demonstrations of games as a technique for the support of literacy instruction through an enjoyable form of skill-practice; practice in creating games and learning aids from locally available materials, conducted by NFE project staff; and a lecture on principles of adult education and demonstration of the Laubach method currently in Ghana by an official of the Department of Social Welfare and Community Development. Although these one-day schools and workshops were well-attended and enthusiastically received by PEA members, no new literacy classes were established as a result.

The Director of the NFE Program went to Nankese, where the one PEA literacy class was already functioning, and did a demonstration in the development and use of games for the literacy class and facilitators there, so they might use games to augment the Laubach materials they were already using. However, although all enjoyed the demonstration, and classes continued with regular attendance, no games were seen in the classes during subsequent visits.

In March, 1977, literacy was declared the theme for PEA week.

Eastern Region IAE staff and NFE project staff met and agreed that one of the problems with starting new literacy classes might be disillusionment with the Laubach method in current use.

The Mass Education Movement of the '50s and early '60s used the time-honored method pioneered by Laubach. It used a series of three graded textbooks and a chart to learn to equate sounds with symbols. An adult literacy student worked his way systematically through the chart and the three textbooks, and when he finished he was given a certificate of literacy. Volunteer literacy teachers met their classes week after week, guiding their students through the chart and the three books and were given a certificate of appreciation for having been a literacy teacher.

However, years later, the result was that a large proportion of those who had successfully completed the course had lapsed back into illiteracy, and the students and teachers alike were wondering why they had gone to all that trouble. This situation is not unique to Ghana.

Even the Department of Social Welfare and Community Development had lost enthusiasm for the Laubach approach and was waiting for the results of the testing of new "functional literacy" materials being developed under the guidance of World Education, Inc.

It was agreed by the IAE and NFE project staff that a new method might be worth developing and testing in the Eastern Region, especially if it could respond to the specific learning needs of participants rather than attempt simply to certify them as "literate" in a general sense.

So NFE project staff with the able assistance of Ms. Fanny Dontoh, a teacher, PEA member for sixteen years, and former National Treasurer of the PEA, set out to study, test and adapt the method developed for Ecuador. We called it "Learner-Centered Literacy."

It should be noted that we explored the possibility of working closely with the Department of Social Welfare and Community Development in the development of this method, as they are responsible for literacy work in Ghana. However, by the time we had gotten approval from the appropriate level of the bureaucracy, there were only five months left before the end of the project, and we had already begun training facilitators. The Department was, however, very supportive of our efforts, and eager to lend whatever assistance was possible.

2. Learner-Centered Literacy

Ms. Fanny Dontoh explains the Learner-Centered approach as follows:

> Throughout the world many literacy methods have been tried and adopted and are still in use. All these different methods have their advantages and disadvantages. So it may be with the Learner-Centered method. However, although the method was originally developed by Sylvia Ashton-Warner for Maori children in New Zealand, its main principles apply sensibly to adults.
>
> Literacy facilitators often fail in their approach to teach adult learners, because they pursue a strictly authoritarian classroom format. Ashton-Warner stresses the need to create favorable learning conditions to make learning less threatening to the learner. Her method allows the learner to approach written culture on his own terms, rather than using a text. Learners are allowed to learn things important to their lives, making literacy more functional and meaningful to the learner.
>
> Ashton-Warner's method and principles stand against the bossy attitude of teachers to their pupils. The method indicates the need to involve the learners in developing their own reading materials instead of having them developed for them by outside experts.

Ashton-Warner's method emphasizes the need for a facilitator to recognize and respect the knowledge of the learner. The method promotes tapping and teaching from the known knowledge of the learner to the unknown. The learning process is built on a foundation already laid within the learner.

The method proceeds according to the following loosely-defined steps:

a. Create a climate of confidence. Emphasize a peer relationship between the facilitator and the learners. Arrange the learning environment in a way that will encourage conversation and dialogue among learners and facilitator and break down the authoritarian classroom atmosphere.

b. Ask learners what they would like to learn to read and/or write. Find out why they have come to a literacy class and what words or phrases they would find useful. Write the word on the board and in the participant's exercise book.

c. Practice writing the word or phrase on a slate or in notebooks. Note: the manual dexterity required to manipulate pen or chalk can take months for an adult to develop, so it is often advisable to start by tracing the letters on a slate with the index finger dipped in water or trace with finger in a sand tray.

d. Write the words on the blackboard to share with other participants. Play simple word identification games to familiarize learners with words learned. Later add words learned in previous classes for review.

e. Combining words learned into new phrases and sentences. This can be the beginning of simple story writing or stimulate interest in new vocabulary to combine with words learned.

f. Reflection on the importance and use of what has been learned and exploration of ways to use other people as resources for their own learning in the way they have used the literacy facilitator to teach them words.

Although the method is responsive to the needs of the learners, in and of itself it does not address the various and complicated skills which anyone seriously interested in learning to read and write would have to acquire.

So the method was supplemented and complemented by a variety of fluency, or skill-practice games. These games are structured activities through which written language is broken down into manageable problems and presented to the learner for practice. Through such games, learners can practice recognizing words and matching them with pictures or grouping letters on dice or cards to form words. Games have the added advantage of being an enjoyable way to learn and a means to stimulate participation and interaction among learners.

The games were created by the staff and interested PEA members with the following criteria in mind:

a. They should be attractive and self-motivating. Adult literacy programs ask adults to come voluntarily after a day of work, so it would seem that a variety of games to make learning more fun could only be an asset.

b. They should focus attention on the players, not the facilitator, in order to break down the notion that the teacher is the source of all knowledge, and help learners to see that they could learn on their own and from their peers.

c. They should actively involve the participants, instead of encouraging them to be passive recipients of knowledge.

As mentioned earlier, what the method gains in responsiveness it loses in orderliness and rigor. For that reason, we suggested that it could be used to lead into or supplement more systematic approaches to literacy for those who wanted to become really competent in literacy skills.

3. Training Facilitators

After conducting two half-day workshops to introduce the method to the officers of the PEA in the Eastern Region, the staff of the IAE, the Department of Social Welfare and some potential literacy facilitators, it was decided that a series of weekend workshops should be held to train PEA members in the communities we were working with who wanted to start literacy classes.

At the first workshop, held in June, 1977, thirty facilitators attended representing nine communities. The method was introduced and explained; a demonstration lesson was given; and facilitators were given the opportunity to play and become familiar with three skill practice games, which they were then given to take back to their communities.

Three weeks later, a two-day workshop was held. At that time, the participants reported on progress in establishing their classes, and

were given an opportunity to share problems and possible solutions. A much wider variety of games was presented for them to play. They practiced matching learning problems with the appropriate materials and had an opportunity to develop some of their own games and materials for use in their classes.

4. Literacy Support Team

Between the first and second workshops, a Literacy Support Team was formed by three members of the Executive Committee of the Eastern Region PEA and Ms. Dontoh.

The Literacy Support Team agreed to:

1) Support ongoing literacy classes through regular visits;
2) Do in-service training of facilitators during visits under the guidance of Ms. Dontoh;
3) Develop materials, distribute them and test them in the classes;
4) Engage in gathering formative evaluation data and suggest modifications in the method where needed.

The NFE program agreed to provide transportation or reimburse any travel expenses. PEA Regional Executive Committee members donated their time.

5. Problems

The major problem, as has already been suggested, was in getting classes started. The amount of time and energy required of volunteers to establish and maintain literacy classes is formidable, especially at a time when the country is experiencing rapid inflation. Many PEA mem-

bers found it necessary to put their spare time after work into backyard gardens and small farms in order to feed their families.

We explored the possibility of the IAE paying literacy teachers as part-time tutors just as they pay French teachers and others for teaching classes in their adult education program. However, because literacy instruction is not a part of their mandate from the government, and because the Department of Social Welfare and Community Development does not pay its literacy teachers, it was agreed that even if we, as a project, paid our literacy facilitators, the pay would end when the project did, and so would the classes. That would go against the goals of the project, which were to help set up activities that could be maintained after our departure.

We also explored other forms of reward and recognition, because the facilitators made it clear that money was not the only indicator that their work was important and appreciated. Weekend workshops including room, board and transportation, regular visits to their classes, materials for them to use, and letters of appreciation for their work were all suggested as significant motivators for participation by voluntary literacy facilitators.

These incentives were all of the variety that we as a program could offer and that the PEA and IAE could sustain, with the assistance of the German Adult Education Association, after the close of our project.

So we developed our workshops in collaboration with the PEA and IAE and applied through the National Secretary of the PEA to the German Adult Education Association for funding. This funding was granted for

room and board, while the NFE project reimbursed reasonable transportation expenses to and from the workshops for participants. The Literacy Support Team was formed of volunteers to visit the classes regularly, and the project paid for their transportation.

Materials were developed using locally available materials, such as wooden blocks for dice and old textbooks and flash cards available free from the Department of Education or local school teachers. Facilitators were trained in the use and development of these materials. Finally, individual letters of appreciation were given to all literacy facilitators before the close of the project.

The real key to starting classes seemed to be the workshops supported by the visits and in-service training for facilitators in their communities through demonstration lessons offered by the Literacy Support Team.

Once classes were begun, the next problem was the implementation of the Learner-Centered Method. Some of our facilitators were trained teachers, which was an advantage, in that they understood the learning process, how to develop lessons and use materials. But it was a disadvantage, in that they had sometimes to overcome their authoritarian and superior attitude toward the learners. Those who were not trained teachers found the method difficult to implement, without a prescribed set of materials to rely on.

In some communities, the learners and facilitators relied on the Laubach materials supplied by the Department of Social Welfare and Community Development and supplemented occasionally with the Learner-Centered approach. In others, with the in-service training offered by

the Literacy Support Team, the facilitators were able to use the Learner-Centered Method entirely.

A related problem arose with the games and learning materials developed by the project staff and by the facilitators themselves. Visits to classes revealed that the games and materials were rarely used.

Mr. T.K. Hanson, in full-time employment of the District education office as superintendent of several schools, a member of the PEA Regional Executive Committee and Literacy Support Team, and enthusiastic materials developer, was eventually hired as part-time NFE Program staff member in charge of Literacy. He states that:

> The weaknesses of the literacy program could be attributed to insufficient time for practical demonstration lessons among groups at workshops, and developing of materials for demonstration lessons by any individual facilitator. If individual members were given more chance to develop their own materials and made to demonstrate with them, it could have developed their interest in the use of the materials for their literacy classes. Instead they tended to hide them away for fear they might be damaged, lost or stolen.

The scarcity of paper in Ghana was a real problem to be reckoned with. A ream of duplicating paper could cost as much as fifteen dollars and poster board was almost impossible to obtain. So, although the NFE Program made these materials as well as old textbooks and flash cards available to facilitators, they were well aware that once the Program closed, many of these supplies would no longer be available.

One facilitator did, however, make his own paste from flour and water, obtain cast-off materials from the head teacher in his community, and fashion games and materials which were loaned out to learners for use between classes. He is a laborer by profession.

6. Accomplishments

a. The Learner-Centered Method has been adapted for Ghana and has been initially well-received; although it has only been used for a short time, and more follow-up training, observation and modification is required if it is to be offered as a viable method to add to the inventory of existing approaches to literacy.

b. Innovative learning materials, such as skill-practice games, have been developed and introduced. And there are Ghanaians with sufficient understanding of the principles of their development and use to continue to experiment and adapt them, if given the opportunity.

c. Weekend workshops have been held and were well-attended, although there is apparently a need voiced by facilitators themselves for more extensive training perhaps at week-long workshops, although these would have to be scheduled well in advance and during school vacations so volunteers could arrange to leave time to attend.

d. Three new literacy classes have been established and are regularly attended.

e. Learners in these classes are happy with their progress and some have gained literacy skills they consider personally valuable.

f. Many of the classes are composed primarily of women. To the PEA this has suggested a real potential for expanding classes to include subjects of interest to the home such as health,

child care and nutrition, which could be provided by inviting extension agents and other outside experts to address the class. This would be one way of meeting their goal of broadening the base of PEA activities to serve the educational needs of those in rural communities, who are not literate in English.

g. The PEA Literacy Support Team has been formed and could continue to function in support of literacy activities, given a limited amount of support for transportation.

C. What Has Been Learned

The spirit of volunteerism is alive and well in Ghana, but it is a delicate commodity. No one wants to feel exploited. Volunteers must feel that their efforts are appreciated and supported, especially by those who urge them to undertaken voluntary activities.

In the case of PEA literacy activities, volunteers look particularly to the IAE. The support they look for comes in many subtle and not-so-subtle forms:

1. They want to be listened to and consulted about workshops and other activities planned for them.
2. They want practical and concrete assistance in accessing resources from organizations such as the German Adult Education Association, which have pledged financial support for PEA activities such as workshops.
3. Because visits to branches are so important for keeping up the spirit of voluntary activities, they not only want Institute personnel to visit, but they want the Institute to provide

transportation[1] to regional PEA officers and groups such as the Literacy Support Team, so that peer group support within the PEA is feasible.

4. Volunteers want recognition and respect for the work they do. This can come in the form of public praise and acknowledgment, and letters of appreciation, as well as recognition of their newly acquired expertise by involving them in training other literacy facilitators.

5. Volunteers also have hopes for opportunities for further training, either in Ghana or outside the country. As long as PEA members see these opportunities as real and not just illusory, they serve as a powerful motivator.

Literacy work is still problematic in Ghana as in other parts of the developing world. In a recent article by Lawrence Okraku, Senior Organizer for the IAE in the Eastern Region, the following points were made with respect to literacy in Ghana:

> He re ommends first that until all children learn to read and write, there will always be a literacy problem.
>
> Secondly, he suggests that any adult literacy program should focus on young adults, be planned with them to meet their own perceived needs for literacy, and be carried through systematically and conscientiously to the point of achieving a level of skill and expertise that they will find truly functional.

This particular experiment with Learner-Centered Literacy may contribute something worthwhile by providing one way to involve learners in

---

[1]Transportation is a real problem in Ghana. Few individuals have cars, and spare parts are expensive or impossible to obtain, so private cars must be used sparingly if they are to last. Public transportation is limited to a few buses and "trotro's" (trucks with benches in the back) which run on irregular schedules and rarely after dark. With the shortage of spare parts, fewer and fewer trucks are travelling the roads.

the design of a literacy program to meet their own needs. It is not, however, systematic, and as long as literacy work is carried out solely by volunteers, there is some real doubt about the feasibility of developing adult literacy that is both responsive and systematic enough to provide adults with sufficient skills to allow them to enter fully into the world of the literate.

One of the goals of the NFE Program was to help the PEA find ways to broaden the base of its membership to include those not literate in English, and to develop activities which would serve the needs of the rural population.

A literacy class as a PEA branch activity is one approach. In Nankese, such a PEA literacy class has been going on for well over a year, and now others have begun.

However, the task of integrating these rural people into a national organization that conducts all of its business in English is not an easy one, nor would it necessarily be desirable to move toward the use of vernacular languages, as Ghana has so many. It is, however, a problem encountered not only by PEA literacy classes, but by Cultural Groups as well, and is one the National PEA Convention may want to address itself to.

D. Recommendations, Considerations

1. Learner-Centered Method

The method appears to hold some possibility as an approach to the challenge of making literacy instruction meet the needs of learners as they perceive them. Further development is needed.

a. To make the method easier for volunteers who are not trained teachers to implement.

b. Effective training for facilitators needs to be designed that will allow them to feel comfortable with the method, and able to develop and use supporting games and materials. Perhaps a week-long session.

c. Ways need to be found to use a learner-centered approach in combination with other methods for those who want to become competent readers and writers.

d. The use of games should be more rigorously pursued and evaluated to find out:

   (1) If they are useful and enjoyable to learners
   (2) If they are effective tools for skill-practice
   (3) If more games can be designed to address skills not addressed in the games already developed

e. Possibilities could be explored for using Learner-Centered Literacy as a starting point for other educational activities that grow out of an articulation of interests and concerns by learners.

f. PEA members who have worked with the method should be given the opportunity to continue developing the method and testing its effectiveness and possibilities.

2. The Use of Volunteers

It is the consensus of Ghanaians who worked on the literacy part of the project that the Department of Social Welfare and Community Development should reconsider its policy of using volunteers and consider paying literacy facilitators or having their own staff teach the classes,

(1) because it is an indicator of the government's commitment to the eradication of illiteracy, and (2) because there is a danger of raising false expectations regarding programs which rely, for both implementation and administrative support, upon volunteer staff alone.

CHAPTER VI

SUPPORT OF INDIGENOUS VOCATIONAL TRADES

Stephen McLaughlin

CHAPTER VI

SUPPORT OF INDIGENOUS VOCATIONAL TRADES

A. Introduction

One of the more recent applications of nonformal education in developing societies is in support of indigenous vocational trades and their associated training systems. In the past, these small enterprises have often been neglected by educational planners, whose attentions have been directed instead to the larger industries and the formal technical training institutions. However, with the realization that they produce many essential goods and services and train many thousands of young people in these societies, small indigenous enterprises are increasingly being regarded as fertile settings for nonformal education.

One example of such nonformal vocational education is a project that involved the artisans of the wayside mechanics workshops in Koforidua. The project was initiated by one of the UMass NFE staff and his Ghanaian research assistant, in collaboration with the Institute of Adult Education, the People's Educational Association and the Koforidua Artisans Cooperative Society. The project serves as a possible model for the introduction of nonformal education into a previously neglected occupation in a key technical sector of the economy. Specifically, it illustrates how modern educational methods and organization can be adapted to the traditional training of apprentices or the operation of cooperatives and trade associations in that occupation. At the same

time, the project is a demonstration of success in meeting one of the major goals of the UMass NFE Project--namely, to collaborate with Ghanaian organizations in designing, applying and evaluating new approaches to nonformal education in local settings.

The following case study traces the origins of the mechanics project and reviews progress on it to date. A description is given of the client group served by the project, followed by a detailed discussion of the actual processes used to introduce the various activities. The case study concludes by analyzing some of the problems encountered during the course of the project as well as some of the successes it managed to achieve.

B. Wayside Fitting Workshops

In West Africa, wayside fitting workshops are small, privately-owned vehicle repair workshops that take their name from the fact that they are located along the streets and roads of many towns and cities in that region. These workshops usually incorporate a variety of artisans working separately on the same workshop site, including fitters or mechanics, auto-electricians, welders, body straighteners, sprayers, blacksmiths, and upholstery repairmen. The artisans of these workshops often labor under a number of crippling constraints, such as a chronic shortage of spare parts, a limited range of tools and equipment, and inadequate training for workshop personnel. Yet, despite these hardships, the wayside mechanics and related artisans manage to provide a significant portion of the vehicle repair services in the country. Through frequently ingenious, improvised repairs, they are able to keep many

otherwise inoperative vehicles in running condition, continuing to transport people and vital commodities.

In addition to their role as small-scale repair businesses, the workshops also function as indigenous job-training systems. A young man who seeks to become an artisan in one of the auto-related trades can do so by attaching himself as an apprentice to a master in one of the workshops. By becoming an apprentice, the young man can learn in a three to five-year period the skills required of a master artisan in that trade.

The multi-faceted context of wayside fitting workshops offers many opportunities for nonformal education to play a role in improving the working conditions and services of the workshops. One area of considerable importance is the need for basic job training--the upgrading of technical skills and the development of a more comprehensive level of technical competence. There is a need, too, for improvement in other areas, such as shop management, shop safety and cleanliness.

One advantage of introducing such in-service training to the artisans in wayside fitting workshops is that they constitute an already practicing group of skilled workers, rather than scattered unskilled individuals who seek employment in an occupation where jobs may or may not actually exist. This fact insures that whatever is taught to the artisans and their apprentices will be more quickly put to use in real work situations. The same is true for training that is introduced to other kinds of wayside artisans and craftsmen, such as carpenters, carvers, tailors, appliance repairmen, to name a few.

Another potential area of focus is the professional organizations

of such tradesmen. Nonformal education could be directed toward organizing or strengthening cooperatives and trade associations. These bodies, once properly organized, could provide real assistance to artisans by representing their collective interests to government officials, by making group imports of spare parts, tools and equipment or by financially assisting their members in time of need.

C. Initiation of Activity--Strategies and Assumptions

The UMass project with the wayside mechanics and associated artisans of Koforidua began indirectly through a research study into the nature of the apprenticeship training in the wayside fitting workshops. As a result of studying how apprentices learn the skills of motor mechanics, we became interested in finding ways to improve the quality of that training through some type of supplementary training. Our interest in introducing such supplementary training for artisans led us to take on an additional role. We became change agents as well as researchers and our involvement with the wayside mechanics soon became divided equally between the responsibilities of the research and those of the action project.

The decision to adopt such a dual role in working with this group was based on two fundamental convictions:

1) That a foreign researcher should attempt to contribute something of benefit to the group or community he is studying;
2) That he, as an external change agent, can intervene in a positive way to help achieve desirable social goals.

While it was not expected that our research would mesh with the

action project in every respect (as it in fact did not), it was assumed that the two activities were at least compatible if not mutually reinforcing. The research would undoubtedly produce insights that would be of use in the project. And certainly the favorable reaction from the artisans to our assuming the role of change agents meant that our research would also enjoy their support.

From the beginning, it was assumed that any effort to develop an educational program with the wayside artisans would be more successful if introduced through some sort of local trade organization that included a number of wayside fitting workshops in the community. A program which involved more than just a few isolated workshops would have a better chance to make an observable impact and achieve wide acceptance in the artisan community. If such an approach were to be used, however, either an existing organization would have to be found or we would have to go to the trouble of creating one.

Fortunately, such a trade association already existed in Koforidua. Known locally as the Koforidua Artisans Cooperative Society, this association was clearly the kind of organization we had in mind to work with. It had been in existence for three years and was officially registered with the Department of Cooperatives. Composed of about fifty members, the organization had a full set of officers, issued membership cards, met regularly twice a month, and made regular collections of dues from its members.

The Koforidua Artisans Cooperative Society was indeed a functioning reality, but it had been languishing for several years in a severely depressed state. The attendance at the general meetings of the Society

was poor and there was a steadily diminishing membership. Although the Society had accumulated a substantial sum in its treasury, many members had long since stopped paying their dues and had no intention of starting again. Furthermore, none of the Society's major goals had been achieved over the last few years. Among these goals was a plan to purchase and operate a cooperatively-owned wrecker truck, a vague scheme to establish a cooperatively run spare parts business and, above all, a proposed government plan to relocate all the wayside fitting workshops in Koforidua on a common site.

The depressed state of the Society prompted us to make several strategic decisions at the outset. Although the introduction of the mechanics training program was a high priority, we decided to focus our attention on the expressed needs of the artisans themselves. Of all their needs, the proposed workshop project was by far the most pressing. Although originally conceived by the Government, the project had soon won the enthusiastic support of the artisans, who were keenly interested in its implementation. However, after a few abortive starts, it had long remained nothing but a plan on paper in the local Town Planning Office. Because of the intense frustration of the artisans over the delay of the project, it made sense to attempt to find a solution to the problem. Moreover, it was apparent that artisan support for the educational activities to be introduced later would be more forthcoming once visible progress had been made on the workshop site.

The inability of the Koforidua Artisans Cooperative Society to achieve its own goals was also a matter of concern to us. In the several years of its existence, the Society had done little to look after the

interests of the general artisan community. It had not, for example, been able to petition the Government successfully to begin work on the workshop project. Nor had it yet made application for a license to import spare parts for the cooperative business or drawn up a plan to acquire the proposed wrecker truck.

The Society's lack of success in accomplishing its program could be traced to some serious internal problems in the Society. One possible source of difficulty was ineffective leadership by the officers of the Society. If the leadership were weak (as it appeared to us it was), it would not only partly account for the unhealthy state of the Society, but would also probably prevent the Society from assuming a more active future role in artisan affairs. Since there seemed to be a close link between the internal effectiveness of the Society and its ability to serve the larger artisan community, we decided to deal directly with these internal problems.

A final strategic decision we made was to try to draw together a coalition of support for the action project. We had begun to realize that if our efforts on behalf of the artisans were to be successful and permanent, they could not just be a campaign waged by isolated individuals. They would have to be organized as a collaborative program of the various cooperating institutions: the UMass NFE Team, the Institute of Adult Education, the People's Educational Association and the Koforidua Artisans Cooperative Society. To implement this goal, we would have to make a determined effort to include representatives or solicit input from these institutions whenever we planned any significant activity.

D. The Workshop Relocation Project

The proposed community workshop for the wayside fitters of Koforidua has been a major preoccupation of our work with the artisans during our two-year involvement in Ghana. The project is a relatively large undertaking, involving a sizeable outlay of funds by the Ghana Government and the eventual relocation of some thirty-five fitting workshops within Koforidua to a common site on the outskirts of the town.

The rationale for such a massive relocation of workshops and personnel is based on the advantages a central location would provide in terms of easily accessible support services and training opportunities, along with the expected improvement in the appearance of the community. There is a precedent for this concept in other parts of Ghana--namely, Kumasi, where most of the city's wayside fitting workshops have been moved to a common site. Under the Koforidua plan, the new site would be sub-divided into spacious, well-planned workshop plots, which would be made available to artisans for a nominal rent. The latter feature is particularly important to artisans, some of whom face increasing rents or even evictions from their present sites in town. The new site would also be large enough to accommodate the vehicle repair needs of any future expansion of Koforidua. With these advantages, it was little wonder that the artisans were deeply concerned about the impasse in the project.

During the month of June, 1976, efforts were initiated to facilitate the development of the wayside workshop site project. Working in cooperation with Society officers and with the help of IAE and PEA officials, we spent several months trying to identify the specific govern-

ment officers who were responsible for the protracted delay. After a round of inconclusive meetings with various government officials, we decided to appeal to a higher authority for assistance. A meeting was arranged between all parties and the Regional Commissioner of the Eastern Region in late October of 1976. At that meeting, in the presence of officials of the concerned government departments and representatives of the artisans, the Regional Commissioner pledged his full support for the project and formed an Implementation Committee to expedite work on the site. It was this timely intervention by the Regional Commissioner that was responsible for moving the project off dead center.

After several months of searching for a suitable contractor, actual construction was finally begun in February, 1977, and has been proceeding steadily since. As of early 1978, the access road to the site had been constructed and the site cleared of trees and underbrush. As these phases were being completed, plans were being made for the next stages of the site preparation. These stages included the leveling and surveying of the site, installation of water and electricity, and provision of common toilet, washroom, spare parts and machine shop facilities on the site. The Implementation Committee and the artisan representatives have held several planning meetings to deal with these issues and have made regular site visits to monitor progress.

The breakthrough on the workshop project had an encouraging effect on the artisans. There was renewed interest in the Society among many artisans when actual construction work began. Attendance at general meetings of the Society began to pick up and often reached forty mem-

bers. The Secretary of the Society also reported that soon after construction work began a number of artisans began making inquiries about how they could join the organization or reactivate their old memberships. Others visited the new site privately to see for themselves that work had actually begun.

There have been other benefits as well. Where they were formerly exercises in group boredom, the Society's general meetings have since become livier and more informative. The artisans have even begun to debate related issues of concern at the meetings. For example, one particularly controversial issue that has been discussed is the procedure the Government intends to use for allocating workshop plots and the potential role of the Society in allocating those plots to artisans. Many Society members have expressed concern over the possibility that artisans who are not members might be allocated plots without first being instated in the Society. They see the new site as an opportunity to strengthen the Society by granting it some control over the allocation process.

E. Organizational Development Training

The second major area of activity with the artisans was the internal condition of the Society itself. As mentioned earlier, we realized early in our involvement with the artisans that the Society faced serious internal problems which needed to be dealt with if it were to function effectively. However, we needed more information about the nature of these problems before we could plan any rememdial program.

For several months, we regularly attended the Society's general

meetings to gain a better understanding of some of its strengths and weaknesses. One of the specific problems we noticed was the lack of awareness some officers had of what their role in the cooperative should be. For example, some officers relied on other officers to carry out functions that should normally have come under their purview. The officers also did not plan the meetings beforehand and during the meetings they rarely brought up substantive issues for discussion. As a result, the meetings were often sterile, with little dialogue or activity taking place except the calling of the role and the collection of dues.

We learned, too, that some of the officers had originally been elected because they were among the most affluent artisans in town and it was thought their private success would transfer to the Society. But this belief had since given way to a growing cynicism about these officers from some of the struggling rank and file artisans. Many of these rank and file members were sincerely interested in improving the cooperative--which they saw as their main hope for a better life--and blamed their officers for not taking the organization seriously.

Many of these internal problems of the Society appeared to be traceable to a deficiency among the officers in certain leadership and organizational management skills--for example, knowing well how a cooperative should function; knowing the specific responsibilities of one's position in the organization; and knowing how to plan and execute the programs of the organization. Moreover, it seemed that the skills required to manage a small organization effectively were closely related to the skills needed to deal with larger entities--i.e., the

Government. Included among the latter skills would be: the abilities to get access to the right government officials, to discuss specific programs with them, to plan possible solutions to problems together and to follow up on the results of meetings. Because these skills were interrelated, we felt it would be productive to direct our initial efforts towards the enhancement of the "internal" organizational skills.

Our goal in the first training sessions was to help the officers identify some specific skill areas that they wanted to improve; and then work with them individually until there were observable results. In subsequent sessions we planned to use role plays to illustrate the way a cooperative meeting should be run and to demonstrate the specific duties of the officers. We also intended to discuss the use of a livelier meeting format for the Society's general meetings and devise some methods to recruit more members into the Society.

The results of these efforts, however, were generally disappointing. To be sure, several meetings were held in which we discussed the problems of the Society with the officers. And after some encouragement, the Executive Committee did meet and decide to tighten up its ranks, replace delinquent officers and eventually hold new elections. But there was a genuine and, perhaps, understandable reluctance among some of the officers to focus attention on the way they were performing their duties. In their view, they were doing the best that could be expected of part-time, volunteer officers, given their busy schedules in their workshops. Since the success of this planned organizational training required their complete cooperation and participation, we were unable to follow up properly on these initial efforts.

F. The Mechanics Training Program

The third major thrust of the work with the wayside mechanics was in the area of job training. As was suggested earlier, there appeared to be a need for upgrading the technical skills of many wayside mechanics and apprentices, not only in Koforidua but in the rest of Ghana as well.

Much of the deficiency in certain technical skills and knowledge could be traced back to the very training the mechanics receive as apprentices in the wayside workshops. This training seems to be effective in inculcating the basic practical skills of repair work. However, it does little to provide apprentices with a theoretical grasp of motor mechanics. Problem-solving and fault-tracing skills, when they are learned, are picked up almost inadvertently when the apprentice reaches the senior stages of his training and occasionally diagnoses the faults of customers' cars. In light of these realities, it seemed that a training program which could provide the missing elements in a more systematic way would be a valuable addition to the apprentices' training. Informal polling of a number of apprentices in Koforidua confirmed our belief that some kind of supplementary training would be a valuable contribution.

However, it was not likely that this skills-upgrading could be done through a conventional technical training course. Many practicing artisans such as wayside mechanics frequently have never had or have long been removed from formal schooling or formal technical education. As a result, many would find it easier to participate in a training program which is more carefully tailored to their specific educational backgrounds, skill needs and work schedules.

For more than eighteen months, efforts to organize just such a program have been underway. Unlike the workshop relocation project, the training program has required a considerable resource mobilization effort. This has included:

1) Finding a place to hold the classes in the evening;

2) Identifying and training instructors to teach the classes;

3) Obtaining tools, equipment and engine parts for participants to work with;

4) Securing funding to operate the program on a regular basis.

To procure the expensive inputs such as tools and equipment, appeals were made to outside institutions which have traditionally funded these kinds of projects. Fortunately, one of the outside agencies that was appealed to, the Africa Bureau of the German Adult Education Association, was able to secure the necessary mechanics tools and equipment from the West German Government. The Eastern Regional Government in Ghana has also recently made a sizeable contribution to the program by providing the needed furniture and preparing the instructional classroom. The British Council has expressed an interest in assisting with the program by donating a demonstration engine. And, one of the big commercial firms in Ghana with a branch in Koforidua has offered part of its facilities for the classes. The local artisans will be asked to contribute some of the old engine and chassis parts that are lying around their workshops and no longer being used.

Outside assistance has been required for other aspects of the program as well. To design a curriculum which would be specifically tailored to the needs and conditions of practicing mechanics, several

mechanics instructors with wide experience in Ghana were consulted. These included representatives from such formal mechanics training institutions as the Opportunities Industrialization Centre (OIC) and the Kumasi Technical Institute.

To provide the basic institutional support and ensure continuity, the Institute of Adult Education has agreed formally to sponsor the program in collaboration with the Opportunities Industrialization Centre of Ghana. Under this plan the participants will be organized as a dues-paying PEA branch. The Institute will in turn make a considerable budgetary allocation to pay the instructors and meet the other recurrent costs of the program. IAE sponsorship will permit the program to be run at a minimal cost to participants, thus allowing the apprentices of modest means the opportunity to take part in it. OIC, for its part, will provide regular technical support by training instructors and monitoring and evaluating the instructional program.

G. Problems of the Project

Throughout this involvement with the wayside artisans, a number of problems have been encountered. One of these problems was the difficulty of defining exactly what role external change agents should play in such a context. For example, on a number of occasions the artisans appealed to us for direct assistance on the workshop relocation project. The kind of breakthrough they expected on the project seemed to demand a level of intervention in their affairs that we had not anticipated. As we suggested earlier, the ability to deal effectively with the government bureaucracies which were responsible for the workshop

project required basic skills in organizational management. Since these skills had been conspicuously absent from the artisans' earlier handling of the project, it seemed advisable, at least temporarily, to accept their request for help along with the implicit intervention role.

The problem with this strategy, however, was finding a way to transfer the skills we were using as change agents to the artisans themselves. In other words, how could we infuse the artisans with a determination to assume a more active role in solving their own problems, thereby allowing us to withdraw from our interventionist role? Our success in doing this seemed to determine whether the artisans would stand on their own or remain dependent on our presence.

An important question to consider at this point is whether or not artisans really regard a cooperative as compatible with their own individual interests. Artisans are busy businessmen who are often quite reluctant to devote much time to anything which would take them away from their own workshops, even if those activities seem to be in their long-term best interests. One could argue that, as small entrepreneurs, they do not see many benefits in an organization which asks them to make individual sacrifices for a collective good. If this is so, the problem for the change agent is hardly one of training or motivating the artisans, but of trying to identify those few points where the interests of the cooperative and those of the individual might intersect. The counter argument to this is that artisans generally realize, albeit vaguely, the potential value of the cooperative, but lack the skills or incentive to translate that potential into reality. If this view is correct, then the task of the change agent is to lead the artisans to a

state where they are both confident and motivated enough to acquire those skills.

Acting on the assumption that the latter argument was true, we made a deliberate attempt through a variety of means to induce the artisans to accept a more active role in their own affairs. However, as we reported earlier, these efforts were only marginally successful at best. While the artisans readily cooperated with us in most respects, they rarely if ever took the initiative themselves on any activity. They accompanied us to numerous meetings with government officials, but usually remained in the background while we acted as their advocates. In addition, whenever we attempted to introduce leadership training or better management practices into the Society, some of the officers would consistently drag their feet.

There are several possible reasons for the artisans' failure to adopt a more activist role, none of which is an adequate evaluation in itself. In analyzing the nature of our relationship with the artisans, one must realize that their actions are no doubt the result of a complex interaction of factors. For example, it is easy to conclude that the artisans had little interest in improving the cooperative or in the efforts we were making on their behalf. Indeed, there were some artisans who did not seem to care much about the cooperative and would sacrifice little if anything for the good of the group. On the other hand, there were other artisans who fully supported the cooperative, but lacked either the ability or the resolve to act on their own. Possessing basic organizational skills and knowledge is undoubtedly an important prerequisite for decisive action in this situation. Yet, the

lack of such skills and knowledge alone may not fully account for the actions of the artisans either. They may also be afraid to make a demand of the Government and run the risk of being labeled a troublemaker--an epithet they could ill-afford to live with for any length of time. The foreign change agent, endowed as he is with an ascribed status and resident only temporarily in the country, may be more willing to take the action and accept the kind of risks that are unthinkable for artisans.

Regardless of the exact causes of the artisans' actions, we were in effect forced to continue with a rather high level of intervention for much longer than we had originally intended. We resigned outselves to our role in the interim and concentrated instead on keeping the artisans informed of any new developments and including them in any significant activity. By involving the artisans, however passively, in every phase of the action project, we hoped that they might eventually begin to model some of the behaviors we were using as change agents. While this strategy appears to be at odds with less interventionist facilitator models, it seemed to be the only alternative available short of complete withdrawal. As yet, it is too early to determine whether it has succeeded or not in this situation.

A second and related problem of the involvement with the wayside artisans has been the need to establish some continuity for the efforts--that is, to keep the activities going after the change agents leave the scene. Frequently, one of the inherent problems of a small local project is its heavy reliance on a few individuals whose tenure with the project is limited. As the inevitable staff turnovers loom ahead, the problems of continuity have to be anticipated well in advance so that

effective means can be found for others to carry on the work. For example, since considerable amounts of resources were being invested by outside organizations in the mechanics training program, explicit arrangements were needed to secure these investments and guarantee that they would be used for the intended purposes. This was one of the prime considerations in our efforts to institutionalize the operation of the training program as soon as possible.

Happily, a solution to the problem of continuity seems to have been found. Since our departure from Ghana, the Institute of Adult Education moved quickly to assume official responsibility for the activities we began with the artisans. As already noted, the Institute agreed to provide major institutional and financial support for the evening training program for the first two years or until it can be incorporated into another institutional framework. In early 1978, the Institute hired the author's former assistant as a full-time Institute Assistant, specifically to continue the work with the wayside artisans--a move that will go a long way to bring some continuity to the activities.

A third problem area has been the relatively high cost of some of the components of the mechanics training program. Since neither the University of Massachusetts nor the Institute of Adult Education had the means to finance all of these components, it was necessary to seek assistance from outside sources. This very need to appeal for outside support is an illustration of how organizers of local projects are sometimes unable to solve their problems locally and must rely on larger organizations or governmental units for support. Fortunately, we have been able to obtain these resources through the generosity of several

different organizations.

Finally, there are the inherent problems with the micro-level approach itself. Some of the difficulties faced by artisans like auto mechanics--for example, chronic spare parts shortages--are infrastructural in nature and do not lend themselves to easy rememdies at the local level. While artisans might organize a cooperatively run spare parts business that could conceivably improve the local availability of spare parts, it is unlikely that genuine relief from these shortages will come without changes in national economic planning and improved distribution and transportation networks in the country.

H. Positive Effects of the Project

There have been, on the other hand, many positive results emerging from this educational venture. One result has been the demonstration of a useful and practical community project--an activity that can clearly benefit both the recipient artisan group and the community itself. The impact of the mechanics training program, if successfully implemented over several years, should show up eventually in generally improved repair services in the workshops and the resulting benefits to vehicle owners. The plan to relocate the wayside mechanics workshops on the new site now under construction is a project which, its sponsors believe, will not only more rationally organize the repair services in the community but will improve the aesthetic appearance of the town as well. Moreover, the goal of strengthening an artisans' cooperative organization is congruent with national development goals.

Another benefit from the wayside mechanics project has been the

creation of a program which is based on a careful assessment of the needs of a specific group. Any activity that has been undertaken on behalf of or in participation with the artisans has sprung from either a need explicitly expressed by them or from an observed need supported by corroborative research. As such, the program might readily serve as a model for other cities and towns in Ghana where similar conditions and prospects for organizing cooperatives exist.

Thirdly, the project has provided a successful demonstration of inter-institutional collaboration. The efforts of the Institute of Adult Education and the People's Educational Association to support and continue the mechanics training program is a concrete manifestation of that collaboration. The project illustrates collaboration of another sort as well--micro-macro collaboration. A large organization like the German Adult Education Association, operating throughout Africa on what could be called the macro-level, can provide its technical assistance to a micro-level pilot project with the assurance that the needs have been genuinely articulated at the grass-roots. This collaborative approach to program development differs from the usual planning of large aid packages where needs are often assessed much less thoroughly than is possible with a local level project.

Finally, the project has generated many new ideas and potential research questions on a variety of issues, including the following: What is the role of a cooperative in a developing society like Ghana and under what conditions can its functions be strengthened? To what extent do the motivations of entrepreneurial activity interfere with the motivations of running an effective cooperative organization? How

can a group of ordinary citizens like wayside mechanics be trained and motivated to petition government agencies to provide assistance for some socially-useful purpose? And on the question of the planned evening mechanics training program, is it likely that such supplementary training will be a useful and cost-effective way of upgrading the skills of wayside mechanics?

CHAPTER VII

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

David Kinsey

CHAPTER VII

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The original proposal for the project in Ghana spoke of establishing a framework in which a "relationship of professional cooperation and exchange" could evolve between the three parties. As we have seen, one dimension of the project involved various efforts to establish, in the absence of a formal agreement, an informal basis for such cooperation between the institutions. These included the exchange of working interns representing the three groups and joint participation in organizational meetings. The other dimension was the series of action projects guided primarily by an individual project member, with the result that each activity had quite different characteristics. In each case, however, the sub-projects involved direct collaboration with Ghanaian colleagues and either had or sought links with the PEA/IAE.

Observations on what was attempted and learned in these dimensions of the project have been included in the previous chapters. The purpose of this concluding chapter is to offer some observations on the overall program characteristics identified in the Introduction. How viable were the central models or patterns which characterized the approach of this project, and what does the experience suggest about what might be learned about them as options in program design?

A. Combined Service-Training-Research Model

While this integration of three functions was an explicit objective in the terms of the grant supporting the project and in the minds of UMass personnel, the research component was less than explicit in the original project proposal and was most problematic in practice.

When service activities were eventually undertaken in response to local needs, and these were linked with training, the service-training combination was clearly viable and essential. One characteristic of this combination was that the training was often collaborative and closely tied to service activities. Thus both UMass and Ghanaian project members were in a sense trained as they offered service and training to others. Another characteristic was the attempt to employ a facilitating style in which project members aided others in their self-development rather than to be donors or teachers in a traditional manner. For those who were used to service as material aid and training as teaching, this unfamiliar approach was sometimes confusing. Our experience indicated that when the approach to service and training is a new one, it is particularly important to have early demonstrations of this approach which make it clear and understandable, as well as give evidence of its utility.

While it was desirable to start with service-training activities, these proved to be so demanding in time and attention that it was difficult to splice anything like research to this action base. Rather than action research, the most that appeared feasible in these conditions was more like action analysis, as reflected in the previous chapters and other writings based on the sub-projects. On the other hand, to start

with research and then proceed to service and training, as was the case in the wayside mechanics project, poses its own set of problems. Against the background of Ghanaian experience with foreign university people coming to do research, receiving but giving nothing in return, to begin with research runs the risk of producing initial wary or negative reactions.

Our experience here would seem to suggest that if action research is to be integrated effectively with service and training, there is a need for more time and continuity in the field, personal characteristics that combine these capacities, and improved conceptual options for action research that are feasible in difficult settings. If more traditional research, or research and development, activities are undertaken, it would seem they should occur later in the project, or be conceived as joint undertakings with local university counterparts. Indeed, such an arrangement with the IAE might have increased their investment in the project by promising their personnel some benefits, vis-a-vis their university reward system.

B. Tripartite Model

There was a circumstantial logic that suggested the project should involve collaboration between three rather than two parties. In its conceptual approach to nonformal education UMass was ideologically linked with the PEA, which was attempting to become reoriented towards work with villages and the rural poor; as a voluntary educational association the PEA was linked to the IAE, which historically was the parent body and provided financial support for the PEA national

secretary as well as official sanction; and as a university body concerned with adult extension education the IAE was more institutionally analogous to UMass and the locus of any official ratification of the project. On the other hand, if there was primarily a bilateral relationship between UMass and the IAE, activities would tend to be influenced by the more academic orientation of much of the IAE program; and if the relationship were only with the PEA, activities would not tend to have the desirable link with the parent body and its on-going support.

While this trilateral effort was necessary in the circumstances, some of the difficulties in achieving an effective three-way collaboration were inherent in this type of setting. For instance, if collaboration implies some degree of symmetry, the relations between a university-based program, whether foreign or local, and a voluntary association are asymmetrical in important respects. Thus, there is not a structure of equality from which to interact when on one side there is an institution, professionals and funding, and on the other there is not. Also, in many respects the prospective benefits are greater, and the risks less, for the specially funded foreign university and the voluntary association than for the local university program that does not have new resources but faces the time demands of new activities.

Other difficulties were related to the particular character of the parties involved. The UMass field personnel, while having competence in various aspects of nonformal education, had limited experience in project management. This, together with other factors such as the turnover of personnel, made it difficult to achieve an integrated plan of activities based on mutual understanding that might have alleviated some of

the inherent problems in this tripartite relationship. Then there were differences in orientation. The UMass team members were characterized by an orientation towards nonformal education techniques for community development and nonhierarchical facilitating styles that, to occasional confusion for Ghanaians, varied according to individuals. The IAE staff and resident tutors tended to be more concerned with educational programs that taught Ghanaians who wanted formal certification. The PEA volunteers were part-time workers who had been involved in lecture and discussion activities but wanted in many cases to get involved in community development. And finally, the PEA/IAE relationship was marked by trying to sort out the balance between dependence and independence, a relationship that had intricacies not easily fathomable from the outside.

A balanced tripartite relationship in project activities is no doubt difficult to achieve even in more favorable conditions. It would probably be easiest to achieve balance in situations where the primary relationship is between analogous bodies, such as university-to-university, where there is resource availability on both sides. Or if the collaboration is basically between a university and a private organization, elements of balance may be more achievable when each body is relatively organized, independent and has control over separate funding options. By extension, tripartite col'aboration has better prospects for balance when each has a reasonable infrastructure and independence that allows some structure of equality. These favorable preconditions are likely to be more rare in tripartite combinations than in bipartite ones. It has been our experience that in a tripartite situa-

tion without such desirable conditions it is even more important for there to be a genuine agreement among parties on project goals, mutual commitments, project management abilities and continuity if there is to be a chance to compensate for inherent inequalities.

C. Achieved Collaboration Model

The initial project proposal, for tripartite collaboration as drawn up by a UMass team in consultation with some members of IAE/PEA, was never officially signed. While some were in general support, the hesitation of the IAE leadership in arranging a formal commitment was understandable in the light of the constraints noted above, the unfamiliarity with UMass and its approach, and probably an uncertainty if the risks to the IAE in a formal commitment might outweight its benefits. Also, the personal listening and exploratory stance of the initial UMass representative in the field was unobtrusive but also confusing to those looking for a clarification of intent. Concomitantly, the first stage of the proposal was built around an assumed IAE/PEA action in running new pilot community development projects which they apparently were in fact not ready or able to undertake. Without a formal collaborative agreement as a starting point, UMass faced the choice of waiting indefinitely for a negotiated agreement, with the risk of losing available personnel and resources for that time period, or starting activities with informal approval. It was decided to do the latter in the hope that demonstrated utility in the field, and the exchange of interns, would provide the basis for achieving individual, and eventually program, collaboration.

Due to the delayed achievement of momentum in the project, occa-

sioned by logistic and management problems as well as personnel changes, it is difficult to assess the viability of this approach if it were continued longer. It is clear that individual projects garnered significant amounts of individual and group collaboration. The cultural group project was initiated as a result of negotiation and a specific Ghanaian invitation to collaborate. Other projects started with individuals, and counterparts or assistants, and then spread to involving larger numbers of PEA members as well as IAE staff. But what was the link between these conglomerations and the rudiments of program collaboration? The effectiveness of village development/training activities particularly attracted official attention and encouraged greater IAE interest in the project. Preliminary steps were taken to aid the integration of other activities into the IAE/PEA. And by the end of the project UMass and PEA personnel were preparing a proposal for AID funding to the PEA to allow it to continue these activities with occasional supplementary help from UMass. However, it is uncertain if these beginnings would or could lead to more complete program collaboration if personnel continuity and time allowed.

It is apparent from this experiment that progress towards collaboration is governed by the existence of favorable preconditions, suitable personal styles, and appropriate procedures. It is clearly important to have early demonstrations of capacity and effectiveness that at least model collaboration on the personal scale if credibility and the desire to enlarge the collaboration are to be established. But it is not clear how far the achievement of program collaboration can go if there is not some basic structure of equality, either given or acquired,

between the parties.

D. Action-Based Training Model

The project proposal implicitly referred to two types of training. One was integrated around an activity, such as the joint development of a monitoring and evaluation system for pilot projects that included training while doing, or interns at UMass sharing in the task of program development. The second involved the identification of village leaders, providing workshop training in facilitating styles of education leadership, and then aiding the application of these skills in action projects.

In practice the focus of these approaches was modified, except in the case of the interns, and there was a strong tendency to have action precede or parallel training rather than follow it. In the village development project, for instance, the UMass representative and his PEA coworker started with action. In a given village they would find out what development task the villagers wanted done, and then helped the villagers to do this themselves. In the process the pair modeled the facilitator approach in their assistance, and by extension provided training around the action. The result was the accomplishment of the task; the spin-off was training. In the cultural group and literacy project members worked with those already involved in an activity, and either provided training while doing or in separate workshops. Even when workshops were separate from an activity, or at a meeting called for another purpose, there was an attempt to build simulated action into the training.

This approach to training was clearly effective in several respects. In a setting where education traditionally meant lecturing and content

was separated from its application, this type of training joined participation, learning and application. Reports and participant observations spoke of the energy this process generated, and of new awarenesses that resulted. It was apparent that where participants were already engaged in an activity or related job, the prospect of actually using the new skills or ideas was increased. On the other hand, when new action was involved and the participants were not in an existing program or support structure, such as was the case of the village facilitators, there was some doubt as to whether the new thrust and learnings involved in the action-based training would be replicated on their own. In this case there is a particular need for a system of reinforcing and supporting what is started if the training is to take hold.

E. Short-Term Staffing Pattern

The original intent, as indicated in the proposal, was for the UMass field team to include a longer term coordinator and three interns who would spend from three to six months each in Ghana. In addition there were provisions for Ghanaians to come to UMass as interns for brief periods, the hiring of a Ghanaian staff person for work on the villager facilitator project and payments for short-term Ghanaians to perform specific tasks.

The major change from this plan in practice was, as we have seen, the unforeseen need to have three different coordinators over the two-year period. Since it initially takes time for each person to adjust to logistical constraints, become familiar with the setting and develop personal relationships, this meant that especially in the second and

third cycles the particular type of program momentum connected with each one was just reaching its most effective level when it came time to leave.

Since in this type of noninstitutional program setting the development of personal relationships and credibility is particularly important, it meant that sometimes difficult transitional adjustments were necessary for UMass personnel and Ghanaians. In several respects, the second coordinator had an easier time with these transitions as an African with experience in comparable settings than did the third, who did not have African field experience and had a more ambiguous leadership role as project administrator. The fact that the UMass intern who went to Ghana early on to do a combined research and action project with the wayside mechanics stayed throughout the project helped to provide more continuity than would appear from this pattern.

The visit of the first two Ghanaian interns, an IAE resident tutor and an IAE part-time tutor with PEA cultural groups, to UMass helped to clarify program issues and led to the invitation for the UMass intern with prior experience in educational drama to work with the Ghanaian cultural groups. The third Ghanaian intern, a PEA member who had worked on the village development task and returned to continue this as a paid staff member, was proposed by UMass as a Ghanaian co-leader of the project. If this had been possible it would have no doubt eased the transition into the third phase of the project. But this did not receive official approval, perhaps due to the fact that it did not emerge from a formally agreed upon project and procedure, had internal hierarchical implications, and perhaps posed some post-project problems when outside

funding might no longer be available.

It is a testimony to the character of Ghanaian and UMass personnel that so much was accomplished in the context of these constraints. Nevertheless it is apparent from this experience that in a setting where existing program activities and infrastructures are weak, and new departures are being explored, it is particularly important to have a core of foreign and local personnel continuity. Short-term facilitating, demonstration and development assistance seems to encounter fewer difficulties where it is related to existing program efforts, such as the case of the cultural group and literacy activities. Further there is an additional merit in short-term activities being derived from demonstrated capacity and invitation.

F. Multiple Small Project Pattern

In the proposal it was anticipated that there would initially be a common trunk of project activities integrated around pilot projects in village development run by the PEA with the assistance of the IAE, and subsequently additional small projects would emerge where appropriate. But as soon became apparent, the proposed pilot projects did not correspond to what the Ghanaians were programmatically ready to do in that period. Consequently, the project emerged as a series of mini-projects, each directed by an individual member with somewhat different types of collaboration with Ghanaians.

Thus, the original idea of village development activities using the facilitator model was actually modified and implemented as a small project by a UMass coordinator and a PEA member. The research study

of a UMass intern on indigenous apprentice training among wayside car mechanics groups developed into an action project that eventually found funding support for staff from the IAE. An invitation to a UMass intern experienced in the use of educational drama for development helped cultural groups develop their potenitial through demonstration, training and organizational activities. And the interaction between project coordinators, IAE and PEA personnel concerned with literacy classes resulted in the introduction and adoption of a learner-centered literacy method, using games and simulations, that was derived from the UMass Ecuador Project.

It would appear from this experience that the small project pattern may be appropriate in some respects in a situation where there is no initially agreed upon comprehensive program, and where it is desirable to link the particular skills of individual staff with the demonstration and development of new educational alternatives. This approach stimulates and enables the application of personal energy to educational activities close to the level of the target population and permits clearer insights into issues of feasibility and necessary adaptations. In some respects it may also permit more innovative efforts by being less susceptible to the filtering effect of higher officials who in a large, formal project are publicly identified with the activity and have to consider the risks entailed by embarking upon unproved innovations.

On the other hand, the trade-off is that this approach may make coordination, integration into existing program structures and continuity more problematic. Indeed, this coupled with the lack of field project management experience on the part of the UMass field team and problems

in achieving a clearer understanding among themselves and with the IAE of where the overall project should be going, meant that opportunities to link new program ideas and activities with a general strengthening of the PEA as an organization were insufficiently realized in the short run. In the longer term, however, there is little question that the PEA's program effectiveness, especially in the Eastern Region, has been increased significantly.

* * * * *

The UMass, PEA and IAE personnel involved in the different dimensions of this project have undergone an often intense experience, marked both by the turmoil of adjusting to different styles, values and cross-cultural sensitivities, and by the excitement of new ideas and movement. We have tried to reflect this, and some of what was learned from it, in this report.

Participant observations indicate that the early project development was most successful in the numerous examples of personal collaboration around tasks of common concern, in the creation of awareness of new program ideas and preliminary skills in applying them, and in the sense of movement and the possibility of change that resulted. During the latter stage of the project, successful institutional collaboration between the CIE and the PEA in the Eastern Region was well established, as illustrated by the linked program objectives and by joint planning task forces.

Since the end of the project in December, 1977, there have been various program developments stimulated by the project, some of which

are exceeding initial expectations. For instance, in the villages there has been evidence of continuing activity that is different in character from anything that existed before the initiation of the village project. Water supply and school building projects have been completed, and villages have plans for new activities that the PEA hopes to support financially and technically when it gets new funding. The Wayside Fitters' nww evening school program continues to develop with considerable interest expressed by fitters. The IAE has taken over support of a Ghanaian staff member in the project, and is providing financial assistance for materials and instruction; the PEA is assisting in recruiting and administering. The project's Ghanaian literacy team continues to function and is monitored by the PEA. Further, the PEA intends to continue strengthening the role of the Cultural Groups as educational vehicles with new funding and staff assistance. As an offshoot of the cultural group project, AID funding was acquired for some of the project personnel to carry out similar work in another part of Ghana. And the Learning Center established by the project in Koforidua is now being supported and run by the Koforidua branch of the PEA.

Most importantly, the effort late in the project to acquire funding for the PEA to continue to develop what was started in the project has been successful. By fall of 1978 the PEA had received a grant of $370,000 from AID to permit this continued development over a three-year period. The President of the PEA visited the Center at UMass to explore possibilities for further program collaboration based on the past PEA/IAE/CIE model, with specific requests for personnel assistance in the areas of training and administrative/management assistance.

Organizations, like individuals, strive for independence and fulfillment of their capabilities. To the extent that this cross-national project has contributed to these ends for each of the collaborating groups, it can be deemed a success. But this judgment must await the further unfolding of events. Thus in time another chapter on the effectiveness of this project, in terms of its aftermath, may well be in order.